

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

January — March 1957

LONDON

S · P · C · K

1957

*Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

EDITORIAL

Theologia (Athens—June 1956) has an interesting article on the Orthodox teaching with regard to the apostles and apostolic succession. Starting from Cullmann's book on St Peter, which it describes as "the best modern work", it agrees with the importance he assigns to the apostles and endorses his view that they were unique and had no successors. Thus it disposes of Rome and the Petrine claims. It complains however that Cullmann stops there and leaves an impression that the life and history of the Church were cut off from the apostles by their disappearance from the earth. The Orthodox on the contrary believe that the apostles are alive in the Church to-day. "They are really present in her life and it is from them that we draw the apostolic faith." Although their task—to be witnesses of the resurrection and foundation stones of the Church—is unique and in it they can have no successors, this does not mean that there is no sort of apostolic succession. They ordained others, not to succeed them as witnesses and foundation, but to watch over the Church. Thus was started an unbroken chain of superintendence from bishop to bishop down to the present day. In this sense it is strictly necessary to speak of an apostolic succession. "We may say to our Anglican brethren that this apostolic succession has however no meaning at all outside the apostolic faith. The historic succession has meaning only when it guarantees the continued faith of the Church." "We believe in the real, living presence of the apostles in the Church to-day and this is the only source of our doctrine of orders." "Our Protestant brethren are quite right when they reject the Roman conception of orders and perhaps our Anglican brethren would do well to consider, in the context of their discussions with their Protestant brethren, whether their conception of orders is not too Roman."

Readers of the summer number of the *Downside Review* will have had a good opportunity of following the advice given in the last quotation. There, in a very able review of the Presbyterian Professor Reid's *Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry*, the Abbot reasons

out this question of the succession. He makes two valuable points, first that the Apostles were commissioned to be witnesses (the fact that they were *eye-witnesses* made them particularly useful as witnesses, but *witness* was their actual function), and second that in addition they had certain sacramental and governmental duties to perform. This was true not only of Peter but of the rest of the Twelve. "If it is true that St Peter was given by Christ something more than an office of eyewitness, the same is probably true of the rest of the Twelve." After all they are to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and this must refer to the interim period of the Church Militant as well as to the final period of the Church Triumphant, for they are expressly warned against lording it over their brethren. The apostolic function was therefore three-fold: witness, ministry and government, and there seems no reason in the nature of things why they should not have appointed others to succeed them in all three aspects of their function. So far Abbot Butler. It seems clear that the present tendency to distinguish sharply between the apostolic age and the age of the Church should be treated with caution. Incidentally the Abbot writes with considerable appreciation of the Professor's handling of the subject and notes how near he comes to a "catholic" conception of the ministry.

On a quite different subject a good deal more heat is generated by Professor Solomon Zeitlin in the July number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. He entitles his article "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A travesty on Scholarship". His attack is levelled against Mr Allegro and company for the altogether irresponsible way in which, he alleges, they have treated their texts. Happily in this country we have not suffered as much as we might have done from the rash utterances of some of those who have dealt at first or second hand with the archaeological finds. But in America much hysteria has been aroused by one rash statement after another. First it has been alleged that at last we have discovered where John the Baptist and Jesus obtained their teaching. Then it was said that the story of the life (and death) of Jesus had been largely anticipated in the Essene "Teacher of Righteousness". Then the conclusion was drawn that the whole of Christian doctrine would have to be "re-valuated". On the top of all this the American public was told that the latest finds

to be deciphered revealed where a fabulous treasure in plate and bullion had been concealed. Dr Zeitlin pours the utmost scorn on every one of these assertions and shows how little there is in the originals to support them. Indeed he goes so far as to deny that the scrolls will make any substantial difference to our present reading of the history of the period between the testaments. It is to be hoped that now the texts are at last being published we shall soon get agreement among the experts as to their date. Until we have that decision it is really waste of time to try to estimate the value of the finds for the history of doctrine.

Elsewhere in this number we publish some Notes compiled by a group of Anglican divines on the Evanston report *Our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Churches*. The duty of considering such reports on behalf of the Church Assembly devolves upon the Council for Ecumenical Co-operation. In the present instance the Council called together a representative group under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Chelmsford to study the report and comment upon it. That group has done us the honour of inviting us to publish its findings for the benefit of the general public. While we are glad to perform this service we feel constrained to remind readers that we give no other endorsement to such a semi-official pronouncement than we give to articles by private correspondents. The original report on which these notes are a comment is published (price 4d.) by the World Council of Churches as Faith and Order Commission Paper No. 20.

INTENTION AND FORM IN ANGLICAN ORDERS

E. L. MASCALL

"IT IS the fortune of our office", wrote the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1897, in replying to the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, "that often, when we would fain write about the common salvation, an occasion arises for debating some controverted question which cannot be postponed to another time." On his humbler level many a theologian, born controversialists excepted, must have regretfully echoed the thought expressed in these august words. Quite recently the question of the position of the Anglican Church *vis-à-vis* Rome, which seemed to have settled down to a more or less permanent stalemate, has become again a living issue, partly as a result of the unsettlement produced in a number of minds by the decisions of the Convocations in July 1955 concerning the Church of South India. It is in this situation that we are confronted with two new volumes on the validity of Anglican orders by two learned and courteous members of the Society of Jesus. Fr Francis Clark's book,¹ while its controversial implications cannot be ignored, is primarily a scholarly investigation into a technical theological problem, namely that of the precise sense in which Pope Leo XIII declared Anglican ordinations to be vitiated by a defect of intention; it is a model of clarity of exposition and charity of spirit, which anyone who has had to grapple with some of the more turgid and verbose of our contemporary theologians may well acclaim with joy and a sense of relief. Fr Stephenson's book,² which consists of a recent set of articles from *The Month* and includes a reply by the present writer, is more vigorous and controversial in its style, but it too (in the phrase of the Victorian commonplace-book) never transgresses those bounds which can be justified in the quiet tribunal of conscience.

Both Fr Clark and Fr Stephenson rightly point out that, in considering the validity of Anglican orders, the question of form is primary to that of intention. In the present article, however, I shall

deal first, and at greater length, with the question of intention, for it is this to which Fr Clark's study is mainly devoted and upon which he has some definitely new things to say. I shall, however, consider the question of validity of form at the end of this article.

I. THE ALLEGED DEFECT OF INTENTION

1. Various Views.

It is strange, Fr Clark remarks—and here we may certainly agree with him—that, although Pope Leo XIII declared in 1896 that Anglican orders were invalid both through defect of form and through defect of intention, “there still appears to be no agreement as to what and whose intention was declared defective, and why.”³ It is because he claims to be able to give this question a definitive answer that Fr Clark's book is of real theological importance. I shall begin my discussion of it by listing, as he does, the various interpretations that have been adopted as to what the Pope meant by intention, and indicating his judgement upon them.

(a) *The intention of the authors of the Anglican ordinal.* Fr Clark admits that the intention of the compilers of a rite may (though it need not necessarily) result in a defect of *form* if they are heretics, but he points out that the *compilation* of a rite is one thing and its *use* another, and that what we are concerned with is the use made of the rite in actually consecrating and ordaining, especially in the crucial case of the consecration of Parker, upon which the validity of subsequent Anglican orders depends.

(b) *The internal intention of the minister in the strict sense.* I shall leave this interpretation for later discussion, as, although Fr Clark rejects it as it is commonly held, his own view is an amplification or modification of it.

(c) *The minister's intention in determining the meaning of an inherently ambiguous form.* This interpretation is rejected by Fr Clark on the ground, among others, that Leo XIII, so far from considering the form to be ambiguous, condemned it as inherently invalid.

(d) *The antecedent motive of the minister, influencing his choice of matter and form.* On this interpretation, the defect of intention was simply the Protestant purpose of the early Anglicans which led them, presumably unwittingly, to adopt an invalid rite. Fr Clark points out that this “intention”, so called, is not intention in the sense of sacramental theology at all; if the Anglican form is invalid

in itself (or indeed if it is valid in itself) the motives which led to its adoption add nothing to the theological issue.

(e) *The external intention: i.e. the corporate intention of the Anglican Church.* No Roman Catholic authorities are cited as adopting this interpretation, but Fr Clark alleges that it has been assumed by most Anglican authorities, from the Archbishops in their reply to the Pope in 1897 down to the Doctrinal Commission in its report of 1938. If Fr Clark is right, most of the Anglican writers have been defending the Church of England against an attack which had not been levelled against it and most of the controversy simply becomes irrelevant.

(f) *The external intention: i.e. the outward purport of the minister's actions.* Against this interpretation Fr Clark argues that the teaching of Catharinus and others, that all that is needed for a valid sacrament is that the minister seriously uses the right form and matter and that what he wills and thinks as he performs it is irrelevant, had been generally abandoned long before the time of Leo XIII and that it is therefore most unlikely that the Pope would have adopted it.

(g) *The objective intention of the rite itself.* Fr Clark replies, in effect, to this interpretation that only people can have intentions; rites cannot. In so far as this phrase refers to anything it refers to a condition determining the validity of the *form*, and has nothing to do with intention in the theological sense.

Fr Clark thus maintains that none of the above interpretations of the notion of intention is what Leo XIII actually had in mind when he declared that Anglican orders suffered from a defect of intention. (We must, of course, make an exception for the modified form of *b* which Fr Clark himself holds.) It does not follow from this that Anglican orders are not invalid through defect of intention in one of the above senses; they might suffer from other defects than that to which the Pope referred. It is clear, however, from his actual discussion that Fr Clark holds that a defect of intention in senses *a*, *d*, or *e* would not invalidate the sacrament (though it might of course be invalid through defect of *form*), that Anglican orders do not in fact suffer from a defect of intention in senses *f* or *b* (as *b* is commonly understood), and that sense *g* is really nonsense. For Fr Clark sense *c* is irrelevant, as he does not believe the Anglican form to be ambiguous; it is irrelevant for me also, as I do not believe it to be ambiguous either. As it presupposes an assumption which

we both reject, we can therefore set it aside. Anglicans will perhaps wonder at a situation in which, over a period of sixty years, Roman Catholic theologians have been unable to agree about the meaning of a simple papal utterance and in which most of them now appear to have missed the point altogether. If Fr Clark's contentions in this part of his book are sound—and, while I would not endorse every one of his arguments, his conclusion seems to be well-founded—Anglicans may very well be grateful to him for having done most of their work for them. A good deal of their past argumentation will appear outmoded, but that is only because the positions against which it was directed have been shown to be outmoded too. There is nothing discreditable in shifting your ground if your opponent has shifted his first. In the present case, the only interpretation of the Pope's words that remains in the field is Fr Clark's own. We must therefore consider it in detail.

2. Fr Clark's View.

Fr Clark admits that there are serious difficulties in holding that the ordinations performed by the framers of the Anglican ordinal and later Anglican bishops were invalid through lack of interior intention on the part of the minister. Roman Catholic theologians commonly teach that all that is necessary is that the minister should have a general intention to do what Christ or the true Church founded by Christ intends to be done, and that it does not matter if he has a totally false conception of what that is or of the identity of the true Church itself. (Thus it is possible even for a Muslim or an Atheist to perform a valid baptism.) Many well-known passages can be quoted from Roman Catholic writers to this effect. Leaving aside an often quoted passage from Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*⁴ which Fr Bévenot has tried to discredit,⁵ the following may be taken as typical.

"You enquire", writes Bellarmine,⁶ "what if someone intends to do what some particular false church, such as that of Geneva, does, and intends not to do what the Roman Church does? I answer that even this is sufficient. For he who intends to do what the Church of Geneva does intends to do what the universal Church does; since he thus intends to do what a certain Church does because he believes it to be a member of the true and universal Church, although he fails to know what the true Church is."

Or this again from Franzelin, with reference to the Eucharist;⁷

"He who wishes to consecrate the Eucharist and at the same time has the express intention that the Eucharist consecrated by him should not be a sacrament or that, by the consecration which he is supposed to will, should not be a sacrifice, does not hinder by this perverse intention of his the character (*rationem*) either of the sacrament or of the sacrifice."

Or, finally, this from Adrian Fortescue:⁸ "People who are not theologians never seem to understand how little *intention* is wanted for a sacrament (the point applies equally to minister and subject). The 'implicit intention of doing what Christ instituted' means so vague and small a thing that one can hardly help having it—unless one deliberately excludes it."

The position which Fr Clark himself ultimately adopts is that, side by side with this general "Christian" intention to do what Christ intends should be done, there was, in the case of Anglican ordinations and consecrations such as that of Parker, a positive intention to exclude the conferring of sacrificing priesthood, and that this second intention was sufficient to overcome and nullify the general Christian intention. He recognizes that there are very strong arguments against his position and he states them very frankly.

There is first the famous case of the Roman Catholic missionaries in Oceania who were worried by the fact that many of their converts had been baptized by Methodist missionaries who openly taught, and sometimes expressly asserted immediately before baptizing, that "baptism had no effect on the soul". The Holy Office replied in 1872 that in neither case was the intention necessarily lacking.⁹ Then there is the quite recent case in which, in the hope of making it possible for their marriages to be dissolved by the application of the Pauline privilege, the American theologian Dr J. Donovan argued that many converts to Roman Catholicism had never been validly baptized, owing to defective intention on the part of the ministers of the Protestant sects who had baptized them. The Holy Office replied in December 1949 that, unless the contrary could be proved in particular cases, the baptisms must be held to be valid.¹⁰

The principle behind these decisions is that heresy in the intellect of the minister does not invalidate the sacramental intention so long as it is only *concomitant* and does not overflow into a positive intention of the will. It thus becomes necessary, for those who

hold interpretation *b* of Leo XIII's statement in *Apostolicae Curae*, to prove that in the case of the Methodist baptisms in Oceania and the Protestant baptisms in America there was (anyhow as a general rule) a pure error in the intellect having no effect upon the will, whereas in the case of the Anglican consecrators and ordainers there was a positive intention to exclude something which was in fact an essential constituent of the sacrament. This is a distinction which it is, I think, extremely difficult to sustain.

We must note to begin with that the positive intention in question was not the intention to exclude from the sacrament an effect which the minister believed that the sacrament would normally have. Such an intention was indeed present in a remarkable case to which Fr Clark refers,¹¹ of a Bishop Gonzalez of Charcas in the seventeenth century, who was not only accustomed to prohibit anyone who had even a fourth part of Indian blood from offering himself for ordination and to declare that he had the intention of excluding from the sacrament of orders any such person who might deceitfully present himself, but also in the very act of ordination used to repeat this declaration and confirm it with an oath. In 1682 the Holy See gravely reprobated the Bishop's misguided policy but pronounced the orders of such persons invalid. The case, while interesting in itself, is not really relevant to our present concern for two reasons: first that Bishop Gonzalez' intention was to exclude certain *persons* from the effects of the sacrament and not to exclude certain *effects* from the sacrament as such; secondly that Bishop Gonzalez' intention was to prevent the sacrament from having effects which he believed it would have if he did not intend to exclude them, while the Anglican reformers are alleged to have disbelieved that the rite which they were performing (or indeed any other rite) could have the effects in question under any circumstances whatever. The illustration which Fr Clark elsewhere¹² gives of a group of Jacobite lairds toasting the King "over the water" seems to provide a rough parallel to the case of Bishop Gonzalez but none to that of the consecrators of Parker. Furthermore, a toast, unlike a sacrament, has no objective effect, but only a purely subjective effect in the minds of the participants.

3. Belief and Intention.

Now while it does seem to be relevant to distinguish between, on the one hand, an explicit disbelief that a rite which one is about to

perform has certain effects and, on the other hand, a positive intention to exclude effects which one believes it would normally have, it seems quite impossible to distinguish between an explicit disbelief that a rite has certain effects and a positive intention to exclude them when one believes that it would *not* normally have them; at least I do not see how, with any confidence that we were right, we could ever apply this latter distinction in practice. In a letter to the *Church Times*¹³ I carelessly described the Methodist missionaries in Oceania as "explicitly intending to exclude not only the effect which the Catholic Church believes the Sacrament to have, but any effect whatever upon the soul of the recipient". Fr Bévenot¹⁴ was kind enough to point out that what the Methodists did was simply to *deny* that the Sacrament had any effects, and both he and Fr Stephenson distinguish this case from that of the Anglican consecrators, who according to them, positively intended to exclude from their consecration the effects which they did not believe it to have; Fr Clark agrees with his fellow-Jesuits on this point. What we are asked, then, to admit is that it was quite possible for a Methodist, immediately after publicly announcing: "I do not believe this rite will have any effects whatever upon the soul", to perform the rite without positively intending that it should have no effects, while the Anglican reformers did not merely disbelieve that their rite (or any other rite) could confer sacrificing priesthood but in addition positively willed to exclude it. The distinction involved is surely quite inadmissible. The mental condition attributed to the Methodists could hardly exist, except perhaps in a schizophrenic, and even if it could I do not see how we could ever discern whether it was present or not.^{14a} Both Fr Clark and Fr Stephenson hold¹⁵ that the fact that the Methodists in Oceania used the proper form and matter makes a presumption in favour of their intention; it might, however, be argued that the declarations which they were accustomed to make create an even stronger presumption against it, if one is going to hold, as Fr Clark and Fr Stephenson do, that anything is necessary for validity other than the general "Christian" intention.

I think Fr Stephenson is shown to be on slippery ground when he writes: "Surely a Saracen, much more a Methodist, can pour the water intending to perform a Christian rite?"¹⁶ Surely an Anglican reformer, we might add, could go through the motions of the Anglican ordinal intending to perform a Christian rite? (We

must remember that what we are discussing here is the question of *intention*, not of *form*.) When he goes on to assert that "only on the extremely improbable supposition that the frame of mind of the Methodists in question was such that if they had somehow learnt the truth about the sacrament, they would have refused to proceed, would the baptisms have been invalid", he is in fact appealing to a principle of *interpretative intention* which Fr Clark has forcefully argued to be inadmissible.¹⁷ Fr Clark rightly points out that what the validity of a sacrament depends on is the intention which the minister actually or virtually has *when he performs it*, and not a purely hypothetical intention which he would have had if certain unfulfilled conditions had been present but which has never in fact existed. He very reasonably and charitably insists that the Anglican reformers were not such diabolical and malicious monsters that they would have deliberately excluded from ordination the conferring of a sacrificing priesthood if they had known for certain that Christ had instituted one, but he argues that this is altogether irrelevant to the validity of their ordinations. If this is so, it is difficult to see that what is sauce for Fr Clark's Anglican geese is not also sauce for Fr Stephenson's Methodist ganders.

It is important to see what is the evidence on which Fr Clark asserts that in the Anglican consecrations there was not merely heretical belief but a positive intention in the will. It is not concerned with anything that the consecrators said, but simply with their readiness to use the Anglican Ordinal instead of the medieval Pontifical. "They had not merely concomitant error in their minds, or absence of full Catholic intention in their wills, but their act of choosing to use that Ordinal in that historical setting shows that they elicited a positive intention against what is in fact essential to the sacrament of Order."¹⁹ This seems extraordinarily conjectural. We must remember that we are concerned with the positive intention which the bishops had in the *very act of consecrating or ordaining*, not with the views which they (or other people) held when they compiled the ordinal or the views which made them ready to use it. If the explicit declaration of disbelief made by the Methodists immediately before baptizing is not sufficient evidence that they intended positively to exclude the effects from the rite, how can it be maintained that the mere readiness of the Anglican consecrators to use the Anglican Ordinal is certain evidence of

positive intention of exclusion? Is not Fr Clark elevating conjecture above definite evidence? He appears to attribute some importance to the fact that the Methodists did not alter the *form and matter* of baptism. "The fact", he writes, "that the Methodist rite exactly retained the matter and form in use in the Church is enough to make a presumption in favour of the intention of those who use it, provided there is no further evidence of a positive contrary intention in individual cases: a presumption which is lacking in the case of the Anglican Reformers."²⁰ We may surely ask: If the explicit declaration of unbelief made by the Methodists is not sufficient evidence of contrary intention, what is? And if that is not, how can the behaviour of the Anglican reformers be? We shall, I think, see how precarious Fr Clark's case is when we look in more detail at his remarks about positive contrary intentions.

4. *Positive Contrary Intention.*

"Theologians", he tells us,²¹ "teach that when there are two such contrary intentions in the will of the minister conferring a sacrament, a universal will to do 'what the true Church does' normally prevails, even over an intention not to do what the Roman Church does." But, "what if . . . the minister does not realize, owing to error, that the intentions are incompatible with one another, and does not consciously make either conditional to the other?" He rejects the view that our answer must depend on the intention which the minister would have had if he had known the truth about the question; this would be the unacceptable doctrine of interpretative intention. And he admits that, if this was the only way of understanding interpretation *b*, Anglican orders could not be condemned on this ground. However, he argues, with a great deal of illustration from matrimonial cases, that it all depends upon what the positive contrary intention wills to exclude. (We might remark in passing that it is always dangerous to argue from matrimony to other sacraments, owing to the peculiar character of that sacrament, and that it is particularly dangerous in the present case, owing to the difficulty of avoiding confusion between the elements of consent and intention.) He quotes with approval the argument developed by Creusen and Hürth against the thesis of Dr Donovan to which I have already referred. "While observing that a contrary intention merely to exclude the actual flow of sanctifying grace . . . would not necessarily override a

general ‘Christian’ intention, both authors agree that it would be a different matter if the minister’s positive contrary intention were directly against the conferring of the sacramental power or source of grace, which is necessarily present in every valid—even if unfruitful—sacrament. Such an intention would invalidate the baptism, for it would attack the essence of the sacrament.”²² Hürth is in fact quoted as holding that validity is not impaired if there is an intention in baptizing to exclude the *effects*, namely regeneration, justification, remission of sins, but only if the perverse intention bears on the *cause* of those effects, which in one place he oddly describes as simply “the sacramental rite itself” and in another identifies with the power of the sacrament to confer a character. “Whoever sincerely willed a baptismal rite which should not impress a character, would be sincerely willing two things which cannot coexist.”²³ This particular distinction would not seem to help very much in eliminating the difficulty raised by Dr Donovan, for there can be very few Protestants who, while denying that baptism regenerates, justifies, and confers forgiveness, hold that it confers a character in the sense of Catholic theology. Thus, even on Hürth’s view, it would appear to be necessary either to hold that the error of the Protestants did not flow into the will, in which case their baptisms would be valid whatever they believed, or else that it did flow into the will in which case it bore on the character and so made the baptisms invalid. It is, however, interesting to see how Fr Clark applies Hürth’s distinction to our present concern. “If a minister”, he writes, “makes the object which his will embraces a non-character-bearing baptism, his sacramental intention is vitiated; . . . and so in the same way if a consecrating bishop makes the object which his will positively embraces non-sacrificial Orders (as did Barlow), his sacramental intention is inevitably defective.”²⁴ The parallel between non-character-bearing baptism and non-sacrificial orders is clearly a mistaken one.^{24a} The true parallel would be either between non-character-bearing baptism and non-character-bearing orders, or else between non-regenerating, non-justifying, or non-sin-remitting baptism and non-sacrificial orders. The consequence is that, even on Hürth’s principle, Barlow’s intention would be valid so long as he intended to confer a character, whether a sacrificial one or not.

I do not see, however, how the principle can be maintained without casting doubt upon the existence of a valid ministry anywhere.

For if you require anything for validity more than a minimal intention to perform an official act as a minister of Christ's Church, whatever that Church may be, or if you maintain that that intention can be destroyed by a contrary intention which is by its nature inscrutable, there can be no certainty about any sacraments at all. It is highly significant that Fr Clark twice has to console himself with the reflection that "relying on the promises of her Founder, the Church knows that the Holy Spirit will provide that no serious breach will occur in her succession of Orders and valid sacraments."²⁵ We can imagine what Fr Clark would say if an Anglican tried to defend Anglican Orders on similar grounds. His reply would no doubt be that the Roman Communion alone is the true Church which can rely on this providential divine protection, but this reply would beg the whole question at issue. There is in fact a disquieting and growing tendency in Roman Catholic theology to-day to attribute to the Pope not only the ability to discern the conditions for valid sacraments but also the power to establish them and alter them. This tendency is evident in such books as Mgr Charles Journet's *Church of the Word Incarnate* and Fr Bernard Leeming's *Principles of Sacramental Theology*, but it appears much more clearly in the following passage from Fr Clark:²⁶

It can be argued that when the head of the Church officially rejects a rite as incapable of mediating sacramental efficacy, as he did in the constitution *Apostolicae Curae*, he is not only judging authoritatively about a past dogmatic fact, but is also exercising in the present what may be called "practical infallibility". Even by itself, prescinding from anything that had gone before, this solemn act of the Holy See was sufficient to disown the Anglican rite as not a sacramental rite of the Catholic Church. Thus there has been since 1896 an added source of certainty about the invalidity of the Anglican rite—a certainty based on the "practical infallibility" of the Church's determining decrees, which in the sacramental sphere effectively guarantee what they declare.

Fr Clark goes on to say that he intends to make no further use in his book of this principle that "the Church has an effective power to restrict sacramental validity", but it is clear that if it is accepted it makes the rest of the discussion purely academic. It bears as much on the question of form as on that of intention. And it gives the Holy See the somewhat unfair advantage which is possessed by

the player who not only claims the right to make up the rules but also to alter them in the course of the game.

5. Conclusions.

I do not know how Fr Clark's Roman Catholic colleagues will react to his thesis, but I am sure that Anglicans should receive it with gratitude. It is true that, if he is right, most of the defences that Anglicans have made against accusations of defective intention have been pointless, but this is only because the accusations have been pointless too. Whether his own interpretation of Leo XIII's words is correct I do not feel competent to judge, though my impression is that he has made his point convincingly. (We are still, of course, left wondering at the extraordinary obtuseness of the great majority of Roman Catholic commentators, but that is another matter.) The Pope thus appears to be acquitted of the charge of improvising arguments to buttress up a foregone conclusion. However, the even more damaging consequence emerges that the principle on which he appears to have made his judgement is quite incapable of determining whether either Roman or Anglican orders are valid as regards intention, since, in the last resort, Roman orders have to be guaranteed by the over-ruling action of the Holy Ghost and Anglican orders have to be incapacitated by the Church's exercise of her "practical infallibility". It is thus hardly surprising if the Anglican Archbishops failed to recognize what the Pope was talking about, and if, in their defence of what they called "the intention of a Church in conferring holy orders" they were in fact discussing not so much intention in the strict sense as conditions for the validity of the form. As far as the intention of the minister is concerned, the maligned doctrine of "external intention" (so-called) seems alone to meet the needs of the case, for it alone enables judgement to be passed upon the only factor in the situation which is in fact open to examination, namely whether the minister is acting in his function as a minister or not.

II. THE ALLEGED DEFECT OF FORM

i. In what does it consist?

Although Fr Clark's book is explicitly concerned with the question of intention, he includes a chapter on the defect of form, for, as he rightly remarks, this was clearly looked upon by Leo

XIII as of primary importance. He points out that many Roman Catholic theologians have held (even up to the time of the Apostolic Constitution on Holy Orders of 1947) that in the Roman rite itself the sacramental form for consecrating a bishop was *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. He also remarks that the only reason why the same words and those that follow them (*quorum remiseris . . .*) were not admitted to be the sacramental form of ordination to the priesthood is that, in the Roman rite (though not in some medieval ones), they occur *after* the ordinands have joined in concelebrating the Mass. He argues, however, that these words are not sufficient for their purpose in isolation, since they do not specify the particular order conferred, and that they only receive adequate determination from the setting of the whole rite in which they occur, determination *ex adjunctis*. (This is what some writers have misleadingly called "the intention of the rite"; it is not intention in the strict sense at all.) It is not necessary, he tells us, nor did Leo XIII think it was necessary, for this determination to be made by an explicit mention of the order or a description of its powers; it can be made by the general setting and purport of the rite. But somehow or other it must be made, for sacraments, to be valid, must "signify the grace which they effect". Now, the argument continues, in the Anglican Ordinal this determination is altogether absent, since from those rites everything has been expunged which referred to consecrating and sacrificial priesthood. Fr Stephenson makes the same point in more vigorous language.²⁷

One might imagine that the determination was made quite unambiguously by the use of the words "priest" and "bishop" in the Ordinal and by the explicit declaration in its Preface that the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons which have been in Christ's Church "from the Apostles' time" are to be "continued and reverently used and esteemed" in the Church of England. But no, our authors reply; if you have deliberately removed the reference to sacrificing priesthood the form no longer signifies the grace of the sacrament, and it is altogether invalid.²⁸ This is the defect of form to which Pope Leo referred in 1896.

I have argued, in the letter to the *Church Times* to which I have already referred, that all that can reasonably be demanded as essential for the validity of a rite (except for certain words or actions that are recorded in the Bible as having been attached to it by dominical institution) is that it shall unambiguously identify

what is being done and that, however desirable it may be for it to contain some description of the theology of the action, this is not strictly necessary. Incidentally, both the Anglican Church and the Church of South India go very much further than this in their ordinations, the former, as the Archbishops pointed out in their Reply to Leo XIII, by its statement of the functions of the three orders in the Ordinal, and the latter in addition by the similar statement in the Constitution of C.S.I. In any case, our authors seem to me to go astray in their assumption that the sacrificial status is not merely one of the functions, but the very essence, of priesthood. We have already seen how Fr Clark drew a parallel between the *sacrificial* nature of orders and the *character-bearing* nature of baptism, with the suggestion that the character of priesthood is simply coterminous or identical with its sacrificial aspect. And Fr Stephenson describes the priest's "powers in relation to Christ's Mystical Body", such as the power to absolve, as *secondary* to his "power over his physical body" in celebrating the Eucharist, in such a way that, while a reference to the latter is sufficient to give a valid determination to the form of ordination, a reference to the former is not.²⁹

2. Priesthood and Sacrifice.

It is remarkable that, in spite of their many references to sacrifice and sacrificial priesthood, neither Fr Clark nor Fr Stephenson makes any attempt to define the notion of sacrifice itself in the context of Christian theology. This is most unfortunate, since some of the views of sacrificial priesthood and the Eucharistic sacrifice which were current in the sixteenth century and even later would, I am confident, be repudiated by them as vehemently as by any Protestant reformer. I have indicated elsewhere³⁰ how the common medieval identification of sacrifice with the slaying of the victim led to a theological deadlock which has only recently begun to loosen up. Bishop Gardiner, whom no one could describe as an extreme reformer, observed that "when men added to the Mass an opinion of satisfaction or of a new redemption, they put it to another use than it was ordained for".³¹ Melchior Cano referred to the "insane" opinion of the future cardinal-designate Ambrosius Catharinus "who taught that sins committed before baptism are remitted through the Sacrifice of the Cross, but all post-baptismal sins through the sacrifice of the altar".³² Cajetan commented on "the

common error of many", who "think that this sacrifice [sc. of the altar] has a certain definite amount of merit or makes a certain definite amount of satisfaction *ex opere operato*, which is applied to this person or to that person".³³ In view of the facts that in the later Middle Ages the Christian priesthood had become almost exclusively identified with its sacrificial function and that the sacrificial function itself was conceived in the crudest possible way, it is surely tendentious in the extreme for either Pope Leo XIII or our two learned Jesuit authors to maintain that, in throwing its emphasis upon the pastoral, prophetic, and general sacramental functions of the three orders, the ordinal was destroying the essence of the historic ministry and not, as it explicitly declared, continuing it.

3. The Fundamental Issue.

At this point it becomes clear, if indeed it has not become abundantly clear already, that there are fundamental differences between the two authors and myself about the very structure and nature of the Church and its life. I think that many Anglican writers may well have been misguided in attempting to prove the validity of Anglican orders by appealing simply to the principles of their Roman Catholic opponents, though it needs to be pointed out that only in quite recent years have the divergences of principle become clear. The "practical infallibility" of the Pope, to which Fr Clark has appealed, has been extended to a wider and wider field until it is well on the way to becoming sacramental omnipotence. Any mistake which a Pope may have made in the past is brought in to support this view. It used to be held that when Popes were recorded to have authorized certain abbots to confer holy orders, even including the priesthood, either the record was false or the Pope was in error; now Mgr Journet tells us³⁴ this shows that the Pope can, if he wishes, authorize a mere priest to ordain even to the priesthood. When confronted with Eugenius IV's declaration *ad Armenos* that the matter of ordination was the *traditio instrumentorum*, theologians used to defend the Pope's infallibility by arguing that this unfortunate statement did not satisfy the conditions for an infallible pronouncement; now we are told that the Pope was making the *traditio* to be the matter even if it was not the matter before.³⁵ When the present Pope, in the Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of 1947, located the form of ordination in the

Praefatio of the ordination rite, he was not, we are told, correcting the liturgical ignorance of his predecessors; he was setting up a new form in place of the old.³⁶ As Fr Clark himself says, "theologians are bringing more and more into prominence the Church's *effective* power to determine what is and what is not sufficient to confer the sacrament that Christ instituted,"³⁷ and he quotes a contemporary Belgian theologian, Dr Henricus Schillebeeckx, to the following effect: "To what extent a visible separation from the true Church of Christ exerts an influence on the external rite itself, that is, whether such a rite does or does not continue the ritual profession of the faith of the Church, must be determined by the Catholic Church herself . . . Thus Pope Leo XIII decreed in the concrete that Anglican ordinations do not remain *acts of the true Church*."³⁸ In the same way that the theory of "implicit inclusion" of dogmas in the deposit of faith has enabled the Pope to *make* beliefs necessary to salvation and not merely to *announce* that they are so,³⁹ so the theory of the Church's "practical infallibility" enables the Pope to make sacraments valid or invalid and not merely to announce that they are so. Thus the whole discussion of the validity of Anglican orders really becomes otiose. However, if we refuse to accept this theological development we need not accept the consequences that follow from it, and, while both gratitude and admiration are due to Fr Clark and Fr Stephenson for throwing so much fresh light upon the true nature of our unhappy divisions, I do not think the Anglican position has been in any way undermined by them.

¹ *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, by Francis Clark, s.j. (Longmans, 25s.). Throughout this article I have cited this book and Fr Stephenson's by the surnames of their authors.

² *Anglican Orders*, by Anthony A. Stephenson, s.j. (Burns and Oates, 7s. 6d.).

³ Clark, p. vii.

⁴ 15th ed., p. 717.

⁵ *The Tablet*, Nov. 12th 1955, p. 478.

⁶ *De Sacr. in gen.*, I, xxvii.

⁷ *Tract. de Sacr. in gen.*, thes. xvii, p. 227 (ed. 1873).

⁸ *The Greek Fathers*, p. 94, n.2 (C.T.S., 1908).

⁹ A.S.S., xxv, p. 246, cit. Clark, p. 18f.

¹⁰ Clark, p. 110f.

¹¹ Clark, p. 62.

¹² Clark, p. 108.

¹³ 28 October 1955, p. 11.

¹⁴ *The Tablet*, loc. cit. supra.

^{14a} Fr Henry St John, O.P., has admitted the difficulty of this position in a recent letter to *Theology* (LIX, p. 510, December 1956).

¹⁵ Clark, p. 109; Stephenson, p. 43.

¹⁶ Stephenson, p. 44.

¹⁷ Clark, p. 121f.

¹⁸ Clark, pp. 21f., 115, 161.

¹⁹ Clark, p. 106f. (italics mine).

²⁰ Clark, p. 109. Cf. Stephenson, p. 43.

²¹ Clark, p. 20f.

²² Clark, p. 151.

²³ Hürth, cit, Clark, p. 152.

²⁴ Clark, p. 152.

^{24a} Fr Leeming recognizes this difficulty, but makes the astonishing statement: "The difference is obvious, according to Catholic doctrine: Baptism can be valid without the grace of regeneration, whereas the Eucharist cannot be valid without sacrifice" (*Principles of Sacramental Theology*, p. 474).

²⁵ Clark, p. 61; cf. p. 99.

²⁶ Clark, p. 10.

²⁷ Stephenson, p. 11.

²⁸ Clark, p. 181f; Stephenson, pp. 20f., 37f., 44.

²⁹ Stephenson, p. 37.

³⁰ *Corpus Christi*, ch. iv.

³¹ Sermon on St Peter's Day, 1548.

³² *De Locus Theologicis*, lib. xii, cap. xi.

³³ Quaest. et Quodl., *De Celebr. Miss.*, qu. ii, tom. iii, fol. 76 (ed. 1531). I take these three quotations from F. W. Puller, *The Bull Apostolicae Curae and the Edwardine Ordinal*. Further material may be found in B. J. Kidd's *Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*.

³⁴ *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, I, pp. 113-4. This view was described by Dr E. C. Messenger as recently as 1936 as being "completely opposed to Catholic tradition" (*The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, I, p. 77) and as "practically given up now" (ibid., p. 76, n. 3). In the last twenty years the tide has clearly been running in the opposite direction, for the view so sweepingly dismissed by Dr Messenger is now supported not only by Dr Messenger but also by Fr Bernard Leeming in his recently published *Principles of Sacramental Theology*, where it is described as "admitted by many theologians" (pp. 241; 524, n. 117), and by Fr Joseph Bligh, *Ordination to the Priesthood*, p. 9.

³⁵ Cf. Clark, p. 107n.

³⁶ Cf. Clark, p. 173n.

³⁷ Clark, p. 9.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ The reason for this is that, by definition, a doctrine is implicitly included in the deposit when the only reason for believing that it is in the deposit at all is that the Church has declared it to be necessary to salvation. Cf. Dublanchy, *Dict. de Theol. Cath.*, IV, 1647, s.v. "Dogme".

CHRISTIAN INITIATION

W. G. WILSON

IN HIS review of Dr Thornton's book, *Confirmation, its place in the Baptismal Mystery*, Dr Lampe declared: "The exegesis employed in this book should rather be described as *eisegesis*, an imposition of a pattern upon the text rather than an exposition of its own inner meaning."¹ The more closely one studies recent books and articles on the subject of Christian Initiation, the more evident it becomes that few writers have succeeded in avoiding some measure of *eisegesis* in their treatment of the New Testament and Patristic writings. It may be that even Dr Lampe has indulged in a little *eisegesis* in certain parts of his book, *The Seal of the Spirit*. For instance, in his treatment of the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* he considers that "it is particularly their baptism which has admitted them [the catechumens] into the brotherhood. The Bishop's part is to complete the ceremony with the laying on of his hands, prayer that they might receive grace to serve God according to His will, and signing with the mark of Christ." He then goes on to say: "Confirmation, if we are so to designate the final stage of the initiatory rite, appears to be . . . a complex of subsidiary ceremonies expressive of the bishop's blessing . . . , of his prayer that they may receive grace for positive and active service for God, . . . unction . . . , and of the signing of the Cross . . . ", and he concludes: "All these are of relatively small importance as compared with the baptism itself which gives them meaning and of which they are, so to speak, an explanatory extension."² But even a casual reader of the text of the *Apostolic Tradition* will feel that Dr Lampe is unduly minimizing the significance of the bishop's part in the Initiation. He does not mention that the rite concludes with the words:

Thenceforth they [the newly baptized] shall pray together with all the people. But they shall not previously pray with the faithful before they have undergone *all* these things.

And after the prayers, let them give the kiss of peace.³

These explicit statements should be sufficient to preclude any

suggestion that the baptismal act *without the bishop's part* was sufficient to admit the catechumen into the brotherhood. In this connection it will be remembered that Professor Ratcliff⁴ pointed out that in Justin Martyr's description of Christian Initiation the "washing" of the catechumen is followed by the offering of "prayers in common both for ourselves and for the person who has received illumination", after which "we salute one another with a kiss when we have concluded the prayers" (*Apol.*, lxv). It is surely significant that both in Justin and in the *Apostolic Tradition* the brethren exchange the kiss of brotherhood, not immediately after the "washing" but after the "common prayers" of the Faithful.

A cursory reading of Dix's edition of the text of the *Apostolic Tradition* gives the impression that the Church of his day undoubtedly connected the gift of the Spirit with the bishop's prayer and imposition of hands. Hippolytus says,

And the bishop shall lay his hand upon them invoking and saying :

O Lord God, who didst count these thy servants worthy of deserving the forgiveness of sins by the laver of regeneration, (make them worthy to be filled with) Thy Holy Spirit and send upon them Thy grace, that they may serve Thee according to Thy will : (for) to Thee (is) the glory, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost in the holy Church, both now (and ever) and world without end. Amen.

After this pouring the consecrated oil from his hand and laying his hand on his head, he shall say :

I anoint thee with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost.

And sealing him on the forehead, he shall give him the kiss (of peace) and say :

The Lord be with you.

And he who has been sealed shall say :

And with thy spirit.

And so shall he do to each one severally.⁵

Dr Lampe confesses that if this is the authentic text of the *Apostolic Tradition*, "we should have to conclude that the treatise . . . actually affords early evidence of a divorce in orthodox circles of Spirit-baptism from water-baptism."⁶ He avoids this conclusion, however, by emphasizing that the Latin version of the *Apostolic Tradition* contained in the Verona MS.LV(53) does not contain the words, "Make them worthy to be filled with", in the bishop's prayer. This version suits his argument admirably for it "appears to refer the gift of the Spirit to what has already taken place in the water-

baptism rather than to what is going to happen in the 'confirmation'".⁷ Hence the value of the *Apostolic Tradition* in this discussion must depend on our answer to a problem of textual criticism. Dix's view was that the Latin version of the prayer is corrupt, the words in question having been omitted, and he based his reconstruction of the original on five other versions, viz.: T, Arab., Ethiop., Boh., and K, all of which agree in reading, "Make them worthy to be filled with thy Holy Spirit." Perhaps more may be said in support of Dix than is allowed by Dr Lampe, for the Syriac *Testament of our Lord* (T) and the Arabic *Canons of Hippolytus* (K) are both translations of Greek adaptations of Hippolytus' treatise, while the extant Ethiopic and Boharic versions are based on a Sahidic text. It is probable, therefore, that these versions are all independent of the Verona MS., which Dr Lampe dates as "the late fifth or early sixth century". At least one of them, the Ethiopic, may be dated c. 500 A.D. There is some justification for Fr Crehan's verdict that "The agreement of the Arian fragments with the Ethiopic version of Hippolytus is too remarkable to have been the result of later deliberate adaptation."

If the other versions are correct some explanation must be given to account for the omission in the Latin version. It is unlikely that the Latin text was deliberately altered; the corruption must then have occurred accidentally. Dr Lampe apparently considers that he has disposed of Dix's suggestion of corruption by saying that the Latin text of the Verona palimpsest shows no sign of any major dislocation at this point, nor of any lacuna, and that the manuscript, "though admittedly difficult to read", is reasonably clear. But many students of early manuscripts must feel that Dr Lampe has not sufficiently exhausted all the possibilities before rejecting the view that the Latin text is corrupt.

The Verona text is not the original translation from the Greek of Hippolytus, but merely a copy, or—more likely—a copy of a copy of the original translation. Eusebius (*Vit. Constant.*, iv. 36) says that the Emperor Constantine ordered fifty copies of the Scriptures to be made for use in the churches of his new capital. No doubt copies were made of the original Latin translation of Hippolytus. The Verona MS. could be a copy of one of those earlier copies in which a line had accidentally been omitted. C. H. Turner considered that the original translation into Latin was made c. 420-30 A.D., while Dix pointed out that "The philological peculiarities of the Latin

have suggested to most experts in Patristic Latinity that the translation from the Greek was made about the time of St Ambrose." It is probable, therefore, that at least a century separates the Verona text from the original translation, during which it is reasonable to believe that several copies of the Latin Translation may have been made. A corruption might easily have occurred in an earlier Latin version,⁸ through the mutilation of some words at the bottom of a column, or the accidental omission of a line. The fact that the Verona text is reasonably clear, does not, therefore, rule out the possibility of corruption by an earlier copyist. Nor does it exclude the possibility that the scribe who wrote the Verona MS. may himself have omitted a line from the MS. which he was copying, even if that MS. was the original Latin translation.

Dr Lampe has indeed considered the possibility that some words such as *dignos fac eos repletionis* may have been accidentally omitted if two consecutive lines of the text began with *-tionis*, and the first dropped out accidentally, thus :

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Qui dignos fecisti eos remissionem mere- | (34 letters) |
| ri peccatorum per lavacrum regenera- | (31 ") |
| tionis <i>dignos fac eos reple-</i> | (23 ") |
| <i>tionis</i> spiritus sancti; inmitte in eos tuam grati- | (41 ") |
| am . . . | |

He rejects this hypothesis, however, because the omission of the clause ought to have left *et* standing before *inmitte*, and because the line "*tionis . . . reple*" is "unnaturally short". But the omission of *et* could be the work of a redactor; such corrections were often made by scribes copying manuscripts. His second objection loses much of its weight when we remember that Codex Bezae (VIth cent.), which has been attributed to "a scribe whose native language was Latin",⁹ contains lines varying in length between 14 and 39 letters per line in the Greek version, and from 15 to 41 letters per line in the Latin version. It is unusual to find such great variation in the number of letters per line in early manuscripts, but in the case of the Codex Bezae "The writing on each page occupies a single column, but is not written in continuous paragraphs but in *kola*, or short clauses divided according to the sense; in this way the corresponding words in the two languages are kept strictly parallel."¹⁰ The translator of the *Apostolic Tradition* into Latin might have followed the same principle with the object of making the Latin version correspond line by line with the Greek original.

The most serious objection to Dr Lampe's "reconstruction" is the improbability of the scribe or translator ending a *short* line with an uncompleted word such as *reple-*. In the Codex Bezae the scribe generally ended each line with a complete word, even if he had to continue into the margin in order to do so.

The earliest extant fourth century Uncial manuscripts, however, are more generally written in narrow columns of three or four columns to the page, while in the fifth and sixth century the writing grows larger and the columns broader, so that there are not more than two to a page, and sometimes only one".¹¹ The narrowest columns in the earliest manuscripts have an average of 12-14 letters per line, though others such as the Rylands Fragment of St John (P. Ryl. Gk.457), dated c. 150 A.D. or earlier, has single columns to the page with lines of 29-35 letters; P. Oxy. 208: 1781, a third century papyrus of St John, has an average of 27 letters to the line; while the Codex Alexandrinus (Vth cent.) has an average of some 22 letters per line. The early Uncial manuscripts were written in capital letters without spaces between the words, and usually little variation in the length of the lines (e.g., the Codex Bobiensis, a fifth or sixth century Latin manuscript in rough Uncials, has in ten consecutive lines 25, 27, 26, 23, 26, 18, 28, 24, 22, and 27 letters respectively). Hence, the original Latin translation of the *Apostolic Tradition* might well have been written thus:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| EPI SCOPUS UEROMANUILLISINPON- | (27 letters) |
| ENSINUOCETDICENS : DNEDSQUI | (24 ") |
| DIGNOSFECISTIEOSREMISSION- | (25 ") |
| EMMERERIPECCATORUMPER | (21 ") |
| LAUACRUM REGENERATIONIS | (22 ") |
| DIGNOSFACEOSREPLETIONIS | (23 ") |
| SPUSSCIINMITTEINEOSTUAM | (23 ") |
| GRATIAMUTTIBISERUIANT | (21 ") |
| SECUNDUMUOLUNTATEMTUAM | (22 ") |
| QUONIAMTIBIESTGLORIAPATRI... | (25 ") |

It is not improbable that a scribe might have omitted the second line commencing "DIGNOS . . ." because it is so similar to the earlier line with the same beginning, or more likely because it has the *same ending* as the previous line, viz: "-TIONIS". This kind of error arising from the similarity of adjoining words, "which led the

scribe's eye to slip from one to the other, and so omit the intervening words" is "in one form or another a very common one, and has to be borne in mind constantly in the criticism of manuscripts".¹² It will be noted that our above reconstruction gives lines with no greater variation than 21-27 letters per line. Nor can any objection be raised to this hypothesis on the ground that the lines do not all end with complete words, for in the earlier manuscripts it is quite common to find words broken at the end of lines.¹³ A study of manuscripts reveals, as we should expect, that a line ending with an incomplete word is generally one of the *longest* lines in the column. This is the case in the Rylands Fragment and in most early manuscripts, the Codex Bezae being one of the few exceptions where the margin is used to complete words. Even Dr Lampe's suggestion if set down as it would appear in an early Uncial manuscript with narrow columns in which the *longest* line contains 23 letters (thereby accounting for the break in *reple - tionis*) would look like this:

| | |
|---|------|
| Q U I D I G N O S F E C I S T I E O S | (19) |
| R E M I S S I O N E M M E R E R I P E C C A T - | (23) |
| O R U M P E R L A U A C R U M R E G E N E R A - | (23) |
| T I O N I S D I G N O S F A C E O S R E P L E - | (23) |
| T I O N I S S P U S S C I I N M I T T E I N | (22) |
| E O S T U A M G R A T I A M U T T I B I | (20) |
| S E R U I A N T S E C U N D U M U O L U N - | (21) |
| T A T E M T U A M Q U O N I A M T I B I | (20) |

If due regard is paid to the general character of early manuscripts it must be admitted that either of the above reconstructions is extremely probable, and gives a perfectly clear explanation of the omission in the Verona MS as being due to homoioteleuton. But lest there be any doubt about such a possibility, yet another reconstruction is possible which seems to remove the hypothesis from the realm of mere conjecture, viz:

| | |
|------------------------------|------|
| EPI SCOPUS UEROMANUILLIS | (22) |
| IN PONENS INUOCET DICENS : | (21) |
| DNE DS QUID IGNOS FECISTI | (21) |
| EOS REMISSIONEM MERERI | (20) |
| PECCATORUM PER LAUACRUM | (21) |
| REGENERATIONIS DIGNOS FAC | (23) |
| EOS REPLETIONIS SPUS SCI IN- | (23) |
| MITTE IN EOSTUAM GRATIAM | (21) |
| UTTIBI SERUIANT SECUNDUM | (22) |
| UOLUNTATEM TUAM QUONIAM | (21) |
| TIBI EST GLORIA PATRI ET | (20) |
| FILIOCUM SPUS COINSANCTA | (22) |
| ECCLESIA ET NUNC ET IN SAE- | (21) |
| CULAS AECULORUM AMEN | (18) |

In some respects this reconstruction may be nearer to the original than either of the other two alternatives, since it has less variation in the length of the lines, and it would be extremely easy for the scribe as he was finishing the word *regenerationis* to let his eye slip down to the *tionis* on the line immediately below and thence proceed to write "SPUSSCI . . .", thereby omitting *dignos fac eos repletionis*, "make them worthy to be filled with".

Discussing the distinction between "conjectural emendation, which must be utterly discarded" and the "just use of internal evidence", Dr Scrivener felt that the latter was justified "where external evidence is evenly, or at any rate not very unevenly balanced".¹⁴ Discussing rules of internal evidence "alike applicable to all subjects of literary investigation", he mentions Griesbach's preference for "the briefer reading", but qualifies his own acceptance of that principle by saying: "Yet it is just as true that words and clauses are sometimes wilfully omitted for the sake of removing apparent difficulties, and that the negligent loss of whole passages through *homoioteleuton* is common to manuscripts of every age and character. On the whole," he concludes, "the indiscriminate rejection of portions of the text regarded as supplementary, on the evidence of but a few authorities, must be viewed with considerable distrust and suspicion." The fact that the Verona MS. is the only authority which omits "makes them worthy to be filled with", against the unanimous testimony of T.Ar.E.Boh.K. for its inclusion, the facility with which it can be demonstrated that the Latin omission may be due to *homoioteleuton*, and the extreme difficulty of accounting for the agreement of T.Ar.E.Boh.K. if the Latin be

regarded as the true text, weigh heavily in favour of the retention of "make them worthy to be filled with" as part of Hippolytus' text. A study of Hippolytus' other writings also supports the longer text against the Verona MS., and caused even Dr Lampe to admit that "On the whole, it is probably fair to say that Hippolytus' own conception of the matter stands not far distant from that of the oriental versions of the *Apostolic Tradition*".¹⁵ What is more natural than that Hippolytus' own views had been derived from the apostolic tradition which he had received? On one point at least Dr Lampe concurs with Dix, namely, "that there is no question of Hippolytus himself being an innovator or composing" the *Apostolic Tradition* "out of his own imagination. It is not a new use, introduced for the first time by its author." Hence, if our hypothesis of *homoioteleuton* in the Latin version be accepted, the *Apostolic Tradition* must be accepted as a very early witness to the association of the Holy Spirit with the Laying on of Hands by the bishop as an integral part of early rites of Christian Initiation.

We need not concern ourselves in the present article with the Apocryphal Acts, which are of uncertain date and "essentially popular and untheological". But Justin Martyr's account of baptism is of such importance that Dr Lampe's version of it cannot be allowed to pass without comment.¹⁶ Surely he is indulging in a little *eisegesis* when he says that Justin rests the authority for baptism on John 3. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"? If too much emphasis has sometimes been placed on Justin's alleged silence concerning confirmation, perhaps too little notice has been taken of his silence concerning the Holy Spirit in his account of baptism and its effects. Justin describes how the candidates for baptism "are taught to pray, and beg God with fasting, to grant them forgiveness of their former sins; and we pray and fast with them. Then we bring them where there is water; and after the same manner of regeneration as we also were regenerated ourselves, they are regenerated; for in the Name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, they then receive the washing of water: for, indeed, Christ also said, Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. And that it is impossible for those who are once born to enter into their mothers' womb, is plain to all."¹⁷ It is obvious that Justin here associates the water with forgiveness and regeneration, and loosely

cites John 3. 3 and alludes to 3. 4 merely with reference to regeneration. Apart from the reference to the Threefold Name, he does not mention the Holy Spirit. If he had wished to suggest that baptism in water was "the sacramental medium of the gift of the Spirit", he would surely have mentioned John 3. 5. When he goes on to state the "reason from the Apostles for so doing", he gives the objects of baptism as being "that we might not remain the children of necessity and ignorance, but of choice, and of knowledge; and that we might obtain remission of the sins we had formerly committed; in the water, there is called over him who chooses the new birth, and repents of his sins, the name of God the Father . . . and in the name of Jesus Christ, . . . ; and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who foretold, by the Prophets, all these things about Jesus; does he who is enlightened receive *his washing.*" Justin's silence concerning any gift of the Holy Spirit as an effect of baptism in water cannot be ignored. True, in arguing against the necessity for circumcision, he says, "What need have I of that baptism, who have been baptized with Holy Spirit?",¹⁸ but Professor Ratcliff has satisfactorily shown¹⁹ that this is to be interpreted figuratively rather than literally, and does not, therefore, contradict his earlier account. Hence Justin's writings, if they do not contain explicit references to confirmation, neither do they explicitly associate the gift of the Spirit with baptism in water. At the same time, it will be observed that Justin's account of baptism contains nothing inconsistent with the account given in the *Apostolic Tradition*. That Justin regarded the Baptism of Jesus as typical of the Christian sacrament Dr Lampe does not deny, but he emphasizes that Justin "does not actually say so". Neither does Justin actually say that the gift of the Spirit is received through baptism in water, though Dr Lampe would like us to infer that such was Justin's view. In the case of Justin the *argumentum e silentio* is obviously a two-edged sword which can be used quite effectively against Dr Lampe's main thesis.

Discussing the significance of the Baptism of Jesus, Jeremy Taylor observed, "There are some who from this story would infer the descent of the Holy Ghost after Christ's baptism not to signify that confirmation was to be a distinct rite from baptism, but a part of it,—yet such a part as gives fulness and consummation to it", but he rejected this view on the ground that reason and the context are both against it, "because the Holy Ghost was not given by John's baptism; that was reserved to be one of Christ's glories; who also,

when by His disciples He baptized many, did not give them the Holy Ghost; and when He commanded His apostles to baptize all nations, did not at that time so much as promise the Holy Ghost: He was promised distinctly and given by another ministration.”²⁰ John 4. 1, 2, here referred to, is certainly difficult to reconcile with the view that in the Apostolic Age the Holy Ghost was associated with baptism without Imposition of Hands. If we exclude the events of the Day of Pentecost and the case of Cornelius and his household (which has been called “the Pentecost of the Gentiles”, and is accepted on all sides as being “exceptional”), there is no explicit evidence in the Acts of the Apostles to indicate that the Holy Ghost was normally given in baptism without the Imposition of Hands. There is no explicit mention of the Laying on of Hands in the cases of the Ethiopian eunuch (8. 39), Lydia (16. 14f.), the Philippian goaler (16. 33), or Crispus and the Corinthians (18. 8), *but neither is there in any of these cases the slightest suggestion that baptism conferred on them the gift of the Holy Ghost.* It has been pointed out by more than one writer that there are several passages in Acts which draw a contrast between John’s baptism with water and Christian baptism with the Holy Ghost (Acts 1. 5; 11. 15, 16), while other passages (8. 16; 19. 5) regard baptism as a mere water rite in contrast with the gift of the Spirit received through the Laying on of Hands. Some expositors place these passages in two different categories, but for our present purpose we need only observe that all these passsages have one thing in common, viz., *they do not associate the Holy Spirit explicitly with baptism in water.* In the case of Paul, too, it should be noted that the Holy Ghost is not explicitly associated with his baptism (9. 18), and when he recounted his experience to the people of Jerusalem he did not associate his baptism with the gift of the Holy Ghost but with the washing away of his sins (22. 16). Ananias was sent to Paul that he might receive his sight *through the Laying on of Hands* (9. 12), and he told Paul that he had been sent “that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost”. The use of “fill” is reminiscent of the experience of the other Apostles on the Day of Pentecost when they too “were filled with the Holy Ghost” (2. 4) *without any reference to baptism in water.* Obviously the case is exceptional and not to be taken as a normal case of baptism. It is clear that Paul received both baptism and Laying on of Hands, and if the Holy Ghost is to be directly associated with either, all the

evidence points to his association with the healing through the Laying on of Hands. There remains only the events of the Day of Pentecost which can scarcely be regarded as conclusive evidence that baptism was believed to confer the gift of the Holy Ghost without the Laying on of Hands. There is no indication that Peter and John were doing anything new in Samaria (8. 14ff., the passage is considered more fully below), and there were twelve apostles present who could have conferred the Holy Ghost upon the new converts by Imposition of Hands.

In our consideration of Justin Martyr and the Acts of the Apostles we have deliberately emphasized the paucity of *explicit* statements associating the Holy Spirit with baptism in water, in order to illustrate and emphasize the dangers inherent in the use of the *argumentum e silentio*. That argument has often been used to deprive confirmation of any real significance or apostolic authority. As we have seen, it could also be used virtually to deprive baptism in water of any real significance or association with the Holy Spirit. The Convocation Committees pointed out that "there are only three passages which closely connect the Laying-on-of-hands with Baptism, Acts 8. 14-17 and 19. 1-6, and Hebrews 6. 2".²¹ But we notice that they mention only two passages which *explicitly* associate the Holy Spirit with baptism, viz., Acts 2. 38 and 1 Cor. 12. 13.²² It might justifiably be argued, therefore, that there is as much explicit evidence for deducing that Imposition of Hands was the normal concomitant of baptism as there is for associating the Holy Spirit with Christian baptism. There is no explicit evidence that the Ethiopian eunuch, Lydia, the Philippian gaoler, or Crispus and the Corinthians did not in fact receive the Holy Ghost. True, but if we are to use the *argumentum e silentio* consistently it must also be admitted that neither is there any evidence that they did not also receive the Laying on of Hands (an apostle was present in at least three of those cases). Dr Lampe appears to be very inconsistent in his use of the *argumentum e silentio*. On the one hand, he regards the lack of explicit evidence in the cases of Lydia, Crispus and the Corinthians, and even Apollos, as no evidence that they did not receive the Spirit, but a few lines later²³ he regards Paul's silence concerning the Laying on of Hands in his teaching on baptism as an "obvious objection" to the view that confirmation was practised in the Apostolic Church as a regular part of the initiation ceremony. Here may it be said in passing that although St Paul associates the

Holy Spirit with baptism but does not mention the Laying on of Hands explicitly, he frequently speaks of "receiving the Spirit" and uses the same words which St Luke uses to describe the reception of the Spirit which followed the Laying on of Hands (Acts 8. 17; cf. Rom. 8. 15, Gal. 3. 2, 1 Cor. 2. 12, 2 Cor. 11. 4). W. F. Flemington suggests: "Perhaps the true explanation of St. Paul's silence about the Laying on of Hands is to be found in the fact that to him the symbolism of *immersion* was far more expressive of the particular teaching he desired to emphasize. The mention of the Laying on of Hands in Hebrews vi. 2, side by side with 'teachings about baptisms', in a list of Christian 'fundamentals', would seem to confirm the view that in the first century A.D. the Laying on of Hands was generally understood to be a concomitant of baptism."²⁴ St Paul's action in Acts 19. 1-7 corroborates this view, which is more convincing than the suggestion that on that occasion he was merely correcting an "irregularity".²⁵ Dr Lampe thinks it is surprising that St Paul does not mention Laying on of Hands in his list of ministerial *charismata* in 1 Corinthians 12. 4-10. But neither does he mention Ordination, Baptism, or the Eucharist; he seems to be more concerned with the diversities of gifts rather than the means by which the gifts of the Spirit are received. He does, however, ask: "Are all apostles?" (12. 29), and the context clearly suggests that he meant that not everyone had the same gifts or powers as had apostles (e.g., the power of conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost through the Laying on of Hands, Acts 8. 18, cf. 2 Tim. 1. 6).

In the Introduction of his *Discourse on Confirmation* Jeremy Taylor describes the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit of regeneration in baptism, of renovation in repentance; the Spirit of love, and the Spirit of holy fear; the Searcher of the hearts, and the Spirit of wisdom, and the Spirit of Prayer. . . . It is the same Spirit working divers operations. For He is all this now reckoned, and He is everything else that is the principle of good unto us; He is the beginning and the progression, the consummation and the perfection of us all: *and yet every work of His is perfect in its kind* . . . The Spirit moved a little upon the waters of baptism, and gave us the principles of life; but in confirmation He makes us able to move ourselves. In the first He is the Spirit of life; but in this he is the Spirit of strength and motion."²⁶ The 1948 Lambeth Conference affirmed that "the dissociation of the Holy Spirit's operation from any part of [Christian] Initiation is strongly to be deprecated, as is

also the attempt to measure His operation quantitatively”,²⁷ and this view has been endorsed by the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York.²⁸ As the Giver of Life he cannot be dissociated from our regeneration, which is the beginning of our New Life in Christ, and in the Prayer Book rite we are fully justified, therefore, in praying: “Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant that he may be born again.” On the other hand, as the Archbishops’ Theological Commission pointed out in 1948, “There is no language in the Baptismal Service for Infants which *explicitly affirms* that ‘the gift of the Holy Ghost, apart from His regenerative activity, is conveyed through baptism itself.’”²⁹ It is impossible to justify the extreme contrast between “water-baptism” and “Spirit-baptism”, which has been pressed too far by many modern writers. Much of the confusion and many of the wrong conclusions have sprung from a misguided use of the *argumentum e silentio*. Acknowledgement of the Spirit’s regenerative activity in baptism does not require a denial of his Fulness being conferred in confirmation through the Laying on of Hands. We have seen that there is good reason to accept Dix’s version of the Bishop’s prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*, which associates baptism with the “forgiveness of sins by the laver of regeneration” and proceeds to pray that the newly-baptized may be made “worthy to be *filled* with thy Holy Spirit” (Cf. Acts 2. 4, 9. 17), followed by the Imposition of Hands by the Bishop.

Even if the evidence of Hippolytus is accepted, however, we must still enquire whether the Laying on of Hands is merely a “subsidiary ceremony” which became attached to baptism in the second century, or does it derive from the apostles as the normal concomitant of baptism in the first century? At one time Acts 8. 5-19 and 19. 1-7 would have been accepted as conclusive evidence on this point, but more recently it has been suggested that these passages represent exceptional rather than general procedure in the Apostolic Age. But before we examine some modern expositions of Acts 8. and 19. may we draw attention to Jeremy Taylor’s exposition of Hebrews 6. 1, 2, which has not received as much consideration as it merits. “Here”, he says, “are six fundamental points of St. Paul’s catechism, which he laid as the foundation or the beginning of the institution of the Christian Church; and amongst these imposition of hands is reckoned as part of the foundation, and therefore they who deny it dig up foundations. True, the imposition of hands signifies confirmation, ordination, absolution, visitation of the sick,

blessing of single persons (as Christ did the children brought to Him), and blessing marriages. Now the last three are not pretended to be any part of this foundation; neither reason, authority, nor the nature of the thing, suffers any such pretension: the question then is between the first three. Now it cannot mean absolution of penitents, for there is no evidence that the Apostles used that ceremony in their absolutions, and since baptism is one of the principal parts of the foundation, they needed no absolution but baptismal, which is 'for the remission of sins'. Nor can it mean ordination, because the Apostle says he is going to leave the foundation, and 'go on to perfection', that is, to higher mysteries. Now in rituals, of which he speaks, there is none higher than ordination. Furthermore, 'laying on of hands' in the context follows immediately upon baptism, and in the very next words of his discourse he does enumerate and apportion to baptism and confirmation their proper and proportioned effects: to baptism, illumination, according to the perpetual style of the Church of God, calling baptism *photismos*—'an enlightening'; and to confirmation he reckons 'tasting the heavenly gift', and 'being made partakers of the Holy Ghost', by the thing signified declaring the sign, and by the mystery the rite." Taylor concludes his exposition by saying: "He calls it 'the doctrine of baptisms and laying on of hands': by which it does not only appear to be a lasting ministry, because no part of the Christian doctrine could be changed or abolished: but hence also it appears to be of Divine institution. For if it were not, St Paul had been guilty of that which our blessed Saviour reproves in the Scribes and Pharisees, and should have 'taught for doctrines the commandments of men'. Which, because it cannot be supposed, it must follow that this doctrine of confirmation or imposition of hands is apostolical and Divine. The argument is clear, and not easy to be reproved."³⁰ This exposition is very relevant to present attempts to deprive confirmation of any Scriptural authority, and is in no way weakened by the fact that modern scholars may not agree that St Paul is the author of Hebrews. Neither Dr Lampe nor Dr Oulton attempt to expound the passage with any confidence. The former finds it "hard to understand", and with obvious uncertainty suggests "we may perhaps suppose that the ceremony of fellowship and identification in the apostolic task has come to be applied to ordinary converts . . ."³¹ Dr Oulton dismisses it in a sentence by saying: "We cannot limit

the laying on of hands mentioned in Hebrews vi. 2, to any one rite known to us."³² Until more convincing evidence is forthcoming to prove that the reference to Laying on of Hands in Hebrews 6. 2 cannot mean what we now know as confirmation, we are not unduly perturbed by the fact that in some other passages baptism is mentioned without any explicit allusion to Laying on of hands.

Undoubtedly, as Dr Lampe says, "the imposition of hands in Acts and Hebrews calls for further study".³³ But if there are difficulties in the traditional interpretation of Acts 8. 4-19, 19. 1-7, and Hebrews 6. 1, 2, which sees in these passages the apostolic precedents for confirmation, the alternative interpretations advanced by modern writers also leave many anomalies and questions unanswered. Dr Lampe, for instance, in attempting to explain why Philip's converts had not received the Spirit in their baptism, is driven to the terrible expedient of suggesting that until Philip's action was endorsed by the leaders of the Church, "the gift of the Spirit which was received through membership of the Spirit-possessed community was withheld".³⁴ If, as Dr Lampe believes, the gift of the Holy Ghost was normally received through baptism without the Laying on of Hands, are we to infer that in "an unprecedented situation" the unworthiness, ignorance, or excessive zeal of the minister of baptism may hinder the effect of the sacrament? Has any man power to withhold the gifts of God? It can hardly be suggested that the Holy Spirit disapproved of Philip's action, for, as Dr Lampe says, the Spirit in Samaria "confirms the word of God with signs and wonders"³⁵ (Acts 8. 6), which surely indicates the Spirit's approval. How can this approval be reconciled with the suggestion that the Holy Spirit was withheld from Philip's converts "until the fact had been demonstrated that the leaders of the Church were in full accord with Philip"? According to Acts 8. our Lord's last words to the disciples were: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria . . ." Could anyone knowing of those words be in any doubt about the propriety of admitting Samaritans into the Church? It is inconceivable that Philip should not have heard of Jesus' last words: in all probability his last words, like the last words of many outstanding personalities, were most widely discussed and reported in the early Church. It may indeed have been those words of our Lord which inspired Philip to go on his mission to Samaria. If he told the Samaritans of the words of Jesus, as is most probable since they

would be in the best possible justification for his preaching to them and baptizing them, can they have been in any doubt as to whether they should be accepted into the Church? Dr Lampe mentions Barnabas' visit to Antioch as a parallel to the Apostles' visit to Samaria, but there is no mention of the *Laying on of Hands* by Barnabas, which is surely remarkable if the imposition of hands was used in the Apostolic period as "a token of fellowship and solidarity". The suggestion that some kind of "ordination" is implied in Acts 8. 14-17 and 19. 6 has met with so little support that it need not be discussed further.

Dr Oulton suggests that Acts 8. 4-17 describes "a new departure in the Church" inasmuch as Samaritans were for the first time baptized and that the visit of the Apostles was necessary because Philip "in preaching and baptizing went beyond his ordained commission".³⁶ He considers that the passage "does not assert that the Samaritans did not receive the Holy Spirit in baptism", and he finds parallels between Acts 2. 41-7 and 8. 5-13 which indicate "a life in the Spirit" among the Samaritans prior to the visit of the apostles.³⁷ But the fact that Philip, immediately after the Samaritan episode, continued to preach (8. 35, 40) and to baptize (8. 38) is surely fatal to Dr Oulton's suggestion that Philip in Samaria "went beyond his commission". If he had indeed exceeded his commission we should expect that the apostles would have taken some steps to prevent the repetition of such an error either by reprimanding Philip or by giving him a fuller commission. There is no evidence that either was done, and Philip cannot have been conscious of having committed any error or he would not have continued to preach and to baptize. The chapter ends by informing us that Philip "preached in all the cities until he came to Caesarea", that is, he returned to work in Samaria—a further indication that he cannot have been conscious of having exceeded his commission. Is there any other evidence from the history of the early Church to support Dr Oulton's view that in Acts 8 and 19 "the manifest tokens of the Holy Spirit are granted in order to demonstrate that an irregularity had been set to rights"? In the absence of corroborative evidence, the traditional interpretation of these passages seems preferable, since it has the support of Hebrews 6 and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and is not explicitly contradicted by any other passage in the New Testament. Dr Oulton's attempt to show that the Samaritan converts had received the Spirit before the visit of Peter

and John is unconvincing. Not only is it at variance with Acts 8. 15f., but his parallels between 2. 41-7 and 8. 5-13 are manifestly inconclusive evidence. Reason and the context both suggest that the "joy" mentioned (8. 8, cp. 12. 14) are the people's first and natural reaction to the signs and miracles of healing wrought by Philip, who had already been endowed with the Spirit, as Dr Lampe points out. The baptisms *followed* the performance of the signs according to the order of events in the text (8. 12). There is no evidence that anyone other than Philip performed signs and wonders, or that signs *followed* the baptisms (had such been the case the Laying on of Hands would have been superfluous). The fact that *homothumadon* ("with one accord") is often used in Acts of hostile, anti-Christian Jews and Gentiles (7. 57; 12. 20; 18. 12; 19. 29) renders its occurrence in 8. 6 inconclusive as evidence of "life in the Spirit". Finally, whereas the three thousand who were baptized on the Day of Pentecost "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine" (2. 41, 42, 46), Acts 8. 13 does not refer to *all* the new converts at Samaria but only states that Simon Magus "continued steadfastly" with Philip, and neither the context nor his subsequent conduct suggest that his steadfastness was motivated by disinterested devotion, or a necessary indication of "life in the Spirit".

On the whole, therefore, acceptance of the traditional interpretation of Acts 8. 14-17 and 19. 1-7 is preferable and more easily justified than the above-mentioned theories. Perhaps the opponents of the traditional view have laid too much stress on the alleged silence of St Paul, and the Verona text of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and have paid too little attention to the significance of Hebrews 6. 1, 2.

¹ *J.T.S.*, N.S., Vol. VI, Pt. i, April 1955, p. 112.

² *The Seal of the Spirit*, pp. 135-6.

³ G. Dix, *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, Vol. I, p. 39.

⁴ *Theology*, Vol. LI., No. 334, April 1948, p. 138.

⁵ Dix, op. cit., p. 39.

⁶ Op. cit., p. 138.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 136.

⁸ F. G. Kenyon observes that "No two manuscripts of the Old Latin agree with any closeness with one another" (*The Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1912, pp. 356f). Was it perhaps easier for scribes to err in copying Latin?

⁹ F. G. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 92.

¹⁰ F. G. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 90.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 50.

¹² Kenyon, op. cit., pp. 8f. In the original proofs of this article the opening lines of this paragraph read: "The earliest extant fourth century Uncial manuscripts, however, are more generally written in narrow columns of three or four columns in the earliest manuscripts have an average of 12-14 letters . . ."—a perfect modern example of *homoioteleuton*, due to the fact that in copying the author's typescript, the printer's eye slipped from the second occurrence of the word "columns" to its fourth occurrence (three lines lower down in the typescript) and thence continued with "in the earliest manuscripts . . .". The fact that such an error also escaped the notice of the printer's proof-reader illustrates how easily such errors can occur, and reinforces the author's suggestion that the omission in the Verona MS. may be due to *homoioteleuton*.

¹³ The Rylands Fragment of St John indicates that 7 out of 14 lines ended with incomplete words. *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel*, Ed. C. H. Roberts, p. 28.

¹⁴ *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 1883, p. 492.

¹⁵ Op. cit., p. 147.

¹⁶ Op. cit., pp. 109f.

¹⁷ *Apol.* 61.

¹⁸ *Dial.* 29.

¹⁹ *Theology*, Vol. LI., No. 334, April 1948, pp. 135-9.

²⁰ "Discourse on Confirmation", in Heber's *Works*, vol. XI, p. 236 (1839).

²¹ *Baptism and Confirmation To-day*, 1955, p. 38.

²² Op. cit., p. 36.

²³ Op. cit., p. 67.

²⁴ *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, p. 44n.

²⁵ As suggested by J. E. L. Oulton, Pamphlet on *Confirmation*, A.P.C.K., p. 8.

²⁶ *Works*, Vol. XI, pp. 230f.

²⁷ *Report*, p. 110.

²⁸ *Baptism and Confirmation To-day*, 1955, p. 35.

²⁹ *The Theology of Christian Initiation*, 1948, p. 16.

³⁰ *Works*, vol. XI, pp. 249ff.

³¹ Op. cit., p. 77.

³² Op. cit., p. 7.

³³ *J.T.S.*, Vol. VI, Pt. i., April 1955, p. 115.

³⁴ Op. cit., p. 70.

³⁵ Op. cit., p. 74.

³⁶ Op. cit., p. 7.

³⁷ Op. cit., p. 16.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MARK 6

G. F. DOWDEN

"EACH nature", says Leo in his Tome, "performs what is proper to itself in communion with the other; the Word, that is, performing what is proper to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what is proper to the flesh. The one of these is brilliant with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries". We should not express ourselves naturally to-day in the apparently dichotomous manner of Leo, but we might be brought to do so with a good deal less heart-searching than would the critics of fifty years ago, when "miracle" was being sternly banished from the Gospel record in many quarters. We have been taught by scholars such as Dr Austin Farrer and the late R. H. Lightfoot that the synoptic Gospels are not altogether the simple untheological accounts of the Ministry of our Lord that they were once taken to be; and if this is so, and if at the centre of the Gospel is a figure with far more than the significance of a prophet or a teacher, if (in other words) the Synoptic Gospels set out to give some account of the incursion of the eternal order into the order of this present world, then we must not be surprised when we are confronted with accounts of "miracle". It is the purpose of this short study to consider the importance of the sixth chapter of St Mark in the evangelist's process of revealing the incursion of the Son of God into our world, and to attempt to show that for Mark one of the much maligned "nature-miracles" of our Lord had a place of great honour in his revelation of himself.

The beginning of Mark is, of course, an account of the divine incursion at the Baptism of our Lord in the Jordan, and its attendant miraculous circumstances—the descent of the Spirit and the divine pronouncement from the clouds. The same tone is maintained in the account which follows of our Lord driven by the Spirit into the Wilderness and then coming into Galilee, "preaching the Gospel of God and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the Gospel". This brings us down to i. 15; but perhaps we should continue to read on and include the

call of the first four disciples (verses 16-20) in this section. In any case, the character of the narrative after verse 20 is very different.¹ We have now passed from the events of the first divine incursion and are given an account of the acts and words of Jesus in Galilee. These are, of course, the consequence of the divine incursion, but the tense atmosphere of the incursion itself naturally has no place here. The healings and exorcisms bear witness to the divine incursion of the Christ, but he is urgent that his appearing should not be published.² It is true that he speaks of himself as the Bridegroom, but we cannot be certain that the expression would have, for those who heard, the eschatological meaning which Mark probably intends it to have for his readers.³ On the other hand, his claim to greater authority than the Law and to power to forgive sins naturally incurs the wrath of the authorities who regard it as blasphemous. "Who can forgive sins except one alone, that is God?" they ask, thus testifying unwittingly to the divine incursion of which Mark's readers already know the secret.⁴ "Who is this who speaks thus?" ask the scribes, and after the stilling of the storm the disciples ask, "Who is this whom even the wind and the sea obey?"⁵ The answer to these questions is to be given in chapter six.

This chapter opens with another question. Our Lord is teaching in the synagogue at Nazareth, and his listeners are amazed at his words, and ask, "What is the wisdom given to this man, and these mighty works done by his hands?" He is, in fact, the divine Wisdom, but to his fellow-countrymen he is simply "the carpenter, the son of Mary, and the brother of James and Justus and Jude and Simon".⁶ Luke tells us that our Lord left the people in no doubt as to his Messiahship, reading in the synagogue a messianic prophecy from Isaiah 61. 1f., and claiming that "to-day this scripture is fulfilled in your ears".⁷ If we could be sure that this account of Luke is rightly placed from the point of view of the Marcan order, we should see in it an admirable introduction to what is to follow.⁸ For at this point the Gospel revelation begins to develop in a new way. Up to now our Lord has worked single-handed; he now begins to share his work with the apostles whom he has already appointed.⁹ In other words, we are told of what is sometimes called "The Mission of the Twelve". Professor Vincent Taylor stresses the importance of this Mission when he writes: "Nothing could be more mistaken than to think of their mission as a simple evan-

gelistic tour, in which, so to speak, they were 'tried out' as healers and preachers. . . . They were heralds of the swift advent of the kingdom of God."¹⁰ But the Mission, in Professor Taylor's view, as in the view of many another writer on the subject, was a glorious beginning giving place to hopeless but "immensely fruitful" failure. "Jesus", he says, "did not renounce, and never withdrew, his conviction that the rule of God was near. . . . Through the failure of the mission, the fate of John the Baptist, and his own profound meditation upon the Servant teaching of Isa. 53, Jesus was led to seek a deeper interpretation of the doctrine of the Son of Man."¹¹

But is it as obvious as these words would make it appear that Jesus was disappointed at the results of the Mission of the Twelve? When they were sent out, the Twelve "preached that men should repent, and they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them".¹² It is presumably of these things that they tell our Lord on their return when they tell him "all things whatsoever they had done and whatsoever they had taught".¹³ Luke, as Professor Taylor points out, has a similar account of the return of the Seventy; and to them our Lord says, "I was beholding Satan fall as lightning from heaven".¹⁴ "The downfall of Satan in the last days", says Professor Taylor, "was a current Jewish Christian eschatological expectation." Does not Luke then mean us to see elation rather than disappointment in our Lord's remark? Professor Taylor denies that this can be so. "Is the meaning", he asks, "that Jesus had looked to see Satan fall from heaven, in whatever sense we may interpret the figure, but alas! in vain? Certainly there is reproof in his address to the disciples, 'Rejoice not that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven'?"¹⁵

Our Lord may have reproved the Twelve: it is difficult to see why their Mission in which they had preached the Gospel and cast out demons in his name should disappoint him. Does he not say, "If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you?"¹⁶ If the Twelve at his appointment—or should we perhaps say, at his ordination?—"by the finger of God cast out demons", is not that also a sign that the kingdom of God is come? John the Baptist was told that these are the signs of the kingdom when he asked, "Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?",¹⁷ and by their manifestation of these signs the Twelve

show that "he that should come" is indeed come. The basis for the supposition that the Mission of the Twelve was a disappointment to our Lord is his saying in Matt. 10. 23, "You shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man come". But this saying does not occur in Mark or Luke. And if it is relevant to the Mission of the Twelve as recounted in Mark we can only suppose it to mean that in their carrying out of the work of the Kingdom through the cities of Israel the Twelve *will see* that the Son of Man is come; for, as we have pointed out, there is no sign of disappointment in Mark about the Mission of the Twelve. There is, however, no need for us to consider the relevance or irrelevance of Matt. 10. 23 at all, for in its context in its own Gospel it occurs in a section which looks far more like advice to religious refugees than to missionaries. In Matt. 10 there is a change of character about verse 17. Up to this point we find instructions for the Mission, but beyond it there are warnings such as, "Beware of men, for they will deliver you up to councils, and in their synagogues will they scourge you". "When they persecute you in this city, flee into the next; for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come". Similar advice is given in the "Little Apocalypse" of Mark 13. It would seem that Matthew here is reading into the story of the Mission of the Twelve the conditions of later missionary enterprise.

If we are to dispense with the aid of Matt. 10. 23 in our attempt to understand Mark 6, we shall see that the next section of this chapter follows quite naturally. Verses 12-16 show us one of the results of the Mission. News of the healings and the preaching of the Kingdom comes to the ears of Herod Antipas, and he associates these spiritual events with a miraculous rising from the dead of John the Baptist whom he has beheaded. It is true that at verse 14 we are told that it was of the name of Jesus that Herod had heard, and not of the Twelve; but this is itself a commentary on the character of the Mission and of the identity of the work of the Twelve with that of their Master. They are, as the Mission charge makes plain, sent out with his power and his authority. McNeile's note on Matt. 10. 13 is interesting in this connection: "A greeting uttered by apostles was not a mere friendly wish . . . but had, so to speak, an objective existence."¹⁸ It was, in fact, the greeting of Christ; and he himself says that whosoever receives them receives him. Moreover, to say that Herod was interested in the activities of

Jesus and not of the Twelve is to make an unreal distinction between the sender and the men sent. It is legitimate for us to say that Nelson, rather than the British navy under Nelson, won the battle of Trafalgar; and it is equally legitimate for Mark to identify the Twelve with the name of our Lord. Nor is it surprising that a mission of twelve should arouse more interest, and seem fraught with more potential political danger, than a mission of one.

Herod's supposition that the works of Jesus and the Twelve are due to the rising from the dead of John the Baptist is used as a peg on which to hang the story of John's imprisonment by Herod and of his brutal death. In verse 30 we return to the main theme of the chapter. The Apostles return to Jesus and tell him the results of their Mission. He then invites them to retire for a while from the crowds, for "there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat. And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart". The presence of a great crowd of people about our Lord and the Twelve is probably one of the signs which Herod thought so dangerous to himself; but our Lord's political significance is soon forgotten, and we hear no more in this part of the Gospel of Herod's interest in his activities. As the chapter which we are considering now moves on to its climax, however, we ought to notice how the same Jesus who was rejected at Nazareth and "without honour" is now, after the extension of his work through the Apostolic Mission, sought out by the crowds of Galilee; and to remark that the Twelve have been brought from a potential to an actual power in the Kingdom.¹⁹

There can be little doubt that the evangelist expects us to understand the account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand in a eucharistic sense. But, we would submit, to understand the real significance of this eucharistic meal and its place in the revelation of the Son of God according to St Mark, we must pass on to verse 45, the beginning of the story of the walking of our Lord on the water. A good deal of critical ink has flowed round this episode of the Gospel, mostly in attempts to rationalize what is called a "nature-miracle".²⁰ Let us see what can be made of the story as Mark tells it. Our Lord and his disciples cross the lake in order to avoid the crowds, and on landing at Bethsaida he goes alone to a mountain to pray. It is not clear what the disciples are doing at this time, but we are told that at evening time they are in the boat in the midst of the lake, and that "about the fourth watch of the night,"

when they are struggling against a contrary wind, our Lord walks out across the water to their aid. Now if this were all that there were to the story we might be justified in saying that this is merely a nature-miracle, and engage in controversy as to whether it can be accepted as an actual event or whether it is a sort of allegory, or a simple and easily explicable event which through constant telling has been changed imperceptibly into miracle. We have as yet, however, not reached the real point of the story. The Twelve are terrified, thinking that their Lord is a phantom, and to quell their fears he says to them, "Take heart, it is I; do not fear". As he gets into the boat the wind drops, and they are dumbfounded, "for", says Mark, "they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened". It seems clear that here is something resembling the form-critics' pronouncement-stories; and the pronouncement which the incident enshrines is the "It is I", the *ego eimi* which Moses had heard at the burning bush, and hearing had known that he stood on holy ground,²¹ for these words are the name of God. According to the Fourth Evangelist their utterance in the Garden of Gethsemane when our Lord is apprehended by the authorities causes them to fall back on to the ground,²² just as their utterance on the lake causes the Twelve utter astonishment. It is no phantom that they see but very God.

Mark tells us that they were astonished because they had not understood about the loaves, and their heart was hardened; thus implying that, if their heart had not been hardened and they had understood about the loaves, the walking on the water and the *ego eimi* of their Master would not have surprised them. It would seem then that the secret of his true identity is to be found in the loaves broken before the multitude. It has often been suggested that the story of the Feeding of the Five Thousand has an eucharistic significance. The pronouncement of our Lord's identity in the story of the walking on the water and Mark's explanation of the distress of the Twelve would seem to complete the significance. In the eucharist the bread is blessed and broken, and Christ, very God and very man, is with his Church—*ego eimi*. And Christians whose hearts are not hardened will "understand about the loaves", and not be amazed that their Lord should be present. Is it not likely that Mark, writing as he is from this side of the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection and Ascension, and in the eucharistic experience of the early Church, expects us to understand something

like this from his story of the walking on the water? The Fourth Evangelist would seem to find the same significance in this section as does Mark, for he records precisely the same words of our Lord, *ego eimi, me phobeisthe*,²³ and the incident in the Fourth Gospel precedes the eucharistic discourse of our Lord in which the words *ego eimi* are connected with the Bread of Life (or from Heaven) four times.²⁴ Matthew seems to have missed the significance of the saying about the bread, but the words of the Lord remain the same, and he adds that "they that were in the boat worshipped him, saying, Truly thou art the Son of God";²⁵ in other words, the Twelve worship the *ego eimi*, whereas we are told explicitly in Mark that they do not understand and therefore cannot worship him. The tradition as Matthew received it, or as he handed it on, was different to that extent; the fact remains that for Matthew, as for Mark and John, the episode of the walking on the water is an account of the "divine incursion".

It is held by some scholars that the story of the walking on the water is a Resurrection story which has been misplaced by the evangelists. Certainly it has interesting similarities to Luke's account of the Resurrection appearance of our Lord on the walk to Emmaus; there, as here, our Lord "made as though he would go further";²⁶ Luke says that the disciples "constrained" Jesus to stay with them, Mark that he "constrained" them to enter the boat.²⁷ Luke tells us that the eyes of the disciples were "holden" and that they were "slow of heart", so that they did not know the Lord until "he took the bread and blessed and brake and gave to them". Then "their eyes were opened and they knew him". In Mark the hearts of the disciples were not only slow but "hardened", so that they could not know him or understand about the loaves. It would, of course, be absurd to suggest that any precise difference between hardening and slowness is intended by either evangelist; but the fact that such similar phrases occur in both accounts, and that in both accounts the Lord at first makes as though he will pass his disciples—a strange feature—would suggest that these two stories are of the same sort. We cannot say whether the walking on the water is in origin a Resurrection story like the story of the walk to Emmaus: we can say that like the story of the walk to Emmaus it is concerned with an appearance of the divine Lord in a eucharistic context.

If we are right in supposing that there is a very close connection

between the stories of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Walking on the Water—in fact that the one is not complete without the other—the first feeding miracle will be seen to have a fuller import than the second. Dr Farrer has worked out a convincing theory about the numbers of loaves used in each miracle, in which he attempts to show that the two miracles together demonstrate through the symbolism of the numbers the salvation in the Son of God of Israel and of the Gentiles.²⁸ But we should note that on this theory our Lord only teaches the symbolism of the numbers, and thereby the true meaning of the miracles of feeding, after the second miracle; in the first the meaning should have been quite apparent from the pronouncement *ego eimi*. The hardening of the Apostles' hearts clouded their understanding then, as it still did when after the second feeding our Lord attempted by arithmetic rather than by miracle to teach them of himself. The second feeding miracle comes, in fact, as something of an anticlimax after the great events of chapter six, and in that it shares the character of its context. The divine incursion of chapter six is followed by a dispute with the scribes and Pharisees about their tradition, a tour of Tyre and Sidon with the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter and the deaf mute, and the feeding of the smaller multitude. It seems reasonable enough in these circumstances to ask whether the account of the divine incursion in the story of the Walking on the Water in chapter six is not in fact a misplaced Resurrection story. But we must remember that the account of the divine incursion in the Baptism of our Lord is also followed by apparent anticlimax; and it may be that the fact that the Gospel does not develop as we should expect is evidence of the broad genuineness of the Marcan order, just as we are told—although not so often as we used to be—that the unpolished character of Mark's narrative is evidence of his priority among the Synoptists. After all, we should have expected the crowds who flocked to Jesus and heard his voice to become his firm disciples, and had we not known the Gospel we should not have expected that the Son of God should suffer.

We began by speaking of the sense of divine incursion at the beginning of St Mark's Gospel in the Baptism of our Lord with the voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son". These words are repeated at the Transfiguration, a further divine incursion into the Gospel; and there is nothing else in the Gospels to compare with

these two episodes (at least before the Passion Narratives) save the pronouncement of Jesus to the Twelve as he approaches their boat on the waves. Such is the high claim we would put forward for this neglected "nature-miracle". We have tried to show that there is no reason to suppose that our Lord was disappointed at the result of the Mission of the Twelve; it was rather in their lack of understanding as to the nature of his Person and his ministry that he was disappointed; that those who were sent by him to share in his work should fail to understand by whom they were sent. This, surely, is the meaning of his words after the second feeding miracle ("Do ye not yet understand?") and of Mark's words after the first, "They were astonished because they had not understood about the loaves".

Reference has already been made to the similarities between the story of the Walking on the Water and Luke's story of the Walk to Emmaus. We have noticed that whereas Mark tells us that the disciples' hearts were hardened, Luke says that on the later occasion the eyes of the two who walked to Emmaus "were holden" so that they could not perceive the Lord. Between the second and the third divine incursions in the Gospel narrative (the *ego eimi* of chapter six and the Transfiguration narrative) comes, among much else, the healing of the blind man of Bethsaida, who on being healed sees at first men "as trees walking", and then, on the completion of the cure, "all things clearly".²⁹ Immediately after, at Caesarea Philippi, Peter identifies Jesus as "the Christ";³⁰ that is, he begins to understand who he is. It is only at the Mount of Transfiguration that his whole nature is revealed: "This is my beloved Son; hear him".³¹ The Twelve—indeed even the three privileged hearers of the divine voice at the Transfiguration—do not appear to have understood until after the Resurrection and Ascension; but as far as the Evangelist is concerned the revelation is complete here as at the Baptism and as at the scene of the Walking on the Water. It is as Leo says: here we may see the Word of God entering into the natural order, the Word "brilliant with miracles", from which the miracles of healing spring; the flesh "succumbs to injuries", bearing the humiliation of our flesh. We should not, as we have said, be happy to express ourselves thus, but we see what Leo means—that there are occasions in the Gospel when the Godhead of our Lord is unveiled; and we would submit that for Mark there were three great unveilings, surpassing all the others, and that the Walking on the Water with its divine pronouncement was one of the three.

1 It was interesting to discover after writing this passage that Dr Farrer makes a definite division at 1. 20 on purely literary grounds (*St Matthew and St Mark*, 1954, p. 199).

2 1. 25, 34, 44; 3. 7-12.

3 2. 18ff.

4 2. 23ff, iff.

5 4. 41.

6 6. 1-3.

7 Luke 4. 16ff.

8 It is difficult to imagine the Marcan question about our Lord's wisdom being asked in connection with the clear Messianic claim in Luke.

9 3. 13-19.

10 *Life and Ministry of Jesus*, 1954, p. 107.

11 *Ibid.*, p. III.

12 Mark 6. 12f.

13 Mark 6. 30.

14 Luke 10. 18.

15 *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

16 Luke 11. 20.

17 Matt. 11. 3.

18 *The Gospel according to St Matthew*, 1915, p. 137. This commentator also refers to Isa. 45, 23; 55. 11; Zech. 5. 3f; and quotes Chrysostom on this verse: *ouk aspasmos touto esti psilos all' eulogia*.

19 Cf. Mark 3. 14; 6. 7.

20 G. W. Wade, for instance (*New Testament History*, 1932, p. 409) suggests that our Lord may have been walking on a sandbank, thus appearing to walk on the water, or that the language of faith ("Christ at hand to help his servants, embarked on troubled waters") has been taken literally to refer to an actual event.

21 Ex. 3. 6, 14.

22 John 18. 6; cf. John 8. 24, 58; 13. 19; 18. 5, 6; and in O.T. Isa. 41. 4; 43. 10, 25; 48. 12.

23 John 6. 20.

24 John 6. 35, 41, 48, 51. C. K. Barrett holds that in John the words *ego eimi* "may suggest in the appearance of Jesus the epiphany of a divine figure"; but this would be "an overtone at most". He thinks it unlikely that Mark used the words as the name of God (*The Gospel According to St John*, 1955, p. 234).

25 Matt. 14. 33.

26 Luke 24. 28; cf. Mark 6. 48.

27 The meaning appears to be the same in both Gospels, but the words used are different, *enankase* at Mark 6. 45, *parebiasanto* at Luke 24. 29.

28 *St Matthew and St Mark*, 1954, pp. 57ff.

29 Mark 8. 24.

30 Mark 8. 27-9.

31 Mark 9. 7.

OUR DAILY BREAD

MARCUS N. TOD

THE interesting article entitled "Our Daily Bread" contributed by the Reverend Dr R. F. Wright to a recent issue of this *Review* (vol. CLVII (1956), pp. 340-5) calls for a few comments in the interests of accuracy and completeness.

Dr Wright examines the meaning of the word *epiousios*, which occurs in the Lord's Prayer as recorded by St Matthew (6. 11) and St Luke (11. 3), but nowhere else in extant Greek literature. He devotes special attention to two documents—an inscription of A.D. 22 and a papyrus of the fifth century A.D.—in which the word has been found, or has by some scholars been thought to occur. The papyrus he cites from W. M. Flinders Petrie's *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe*, 33-35 no. 245, but remarks (p. 341) that "Sayce in editing this document passes over this item without comment or translation". This is not wholly true, for on p. 35 Sayce translates the entry *ie epiousi* (which he regarded as an abbreviation of *epiousion*) as "Fifteenth day: for the day's expenses, $\frac{1}{2}$ dr." The further suggestion (p. 342): "It is not without significance that Sayce made no comment upon it. Was the reading of this badly written incomplete word merely a guess or a shot in the dark?" overlooks the fact that Sayce did not attempt to comment upon the individual entries composing this list of eighteen days' expenses (of which only thirteen survive) and that most of the items are purposely abbreviated, as in countless other papyri and graffiti, while it does less than justice to the honesty and competence of such a great scholar as Sayce. The further statement (p. 341) that "in 1928 Professor Stiebitz . . . contributed an article [on the meaning of *epiousios*] to the *Philologische Wochenschrift*" also needs correction, for the article in question appeared in the issue of 16 July 1927 (vol. XLVII, cols. 889-92). The papyrus, it may be added, was republished in 1915 in F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*, I no. 5224.

The discussion of the second document opens with the words (p. 342): "In 1941 Chr. Blinkenberg published his researches into

the Lindos inscriptions which had been unearthed at the Acropolis.⁷ He claimed that inscription No. 419, a decree dated A.D. 22 relating to the formation of a sacred fund for public worship, 'is destined to settle definitely an age-long dispute.' This is seriously, though unintentionally, misleading. Blinkenberg read on the stone *en[. .]usio*, marking the *upsilon* and the *omega* as only partially legible; he restored *en[ia]usio*, the only known word which meets the requirements of the case, and did not suggest the possibility of any other reading or restoration. The reference given in footnote 7 (p. 345), where VI should be read in place of VI-VII, is not to any work of Blinkenberg, but to the opening section of an article by the distinguished epigraphist Professor G. Klaffenbach of Berlin, in which he challenges Blinkenberg's interpretation of *eniausios*, suggests that *nu* is a misreading of *pi*, restores *ep[io]usio*, and makes the claim translated (though with the omission of the words 'I think') by Dr Wright. Thus the "he" in the passage quoted above refers not to Blinkenberg but to Klaffenbach.

Klaffenbach's view met with some support (see, e.g., *Biblica*, XXXV 136-7), but in the *Museum Helveticum*, IX (1952) pp. 60-2, Professor A. Debrunner, the eminent Swiss philologist, who had previously made valuable contributions to the study of the word *epiousios* in *Glotta*, IV (1913) 249-53, XIII (1924) 167-71, and elsewhere, published a note entitled "'Epiousios' und kein Ende", in which he attacked Klaffenbach's arguments and delivered the *coup de grâce* by reporting that an expert examination of the stone, now preserved in Copenhagen, had proved that the second letter of the word in question is unquestionably *nu* and not *pi*. This answers Dr Wright's questions (p. 343): "But is this really final? Did Blinkenberg misread the text?" Yet we must bear in mind that the removal of this piece of evidence for the use and meaning of *epiousios* does not affect that of the Hawara papyrus, nor does it by itself invalidate the interpretation of the word advocated by Klaffenbach.

It is not my purpose to examine Dr Wright's article as a whole, nor am I competent to do so. I confine myself to one further observation. Jerome's translation of *epiousios* by *supersubstantialis* in St Matthew and by *quotidianus* in St Luke shows that he was in doubt about its meaning and prevents us from claiming his authority without qualification for either view. But I find it hard to believe that our Lord, in giving his introductory lesson in prayer to a band of men who were neither philologists nor philosophers.

would introduce into his model prayer so philosophical and recondite a term as is suggested by *supersubstantialis*, and I have little doubt that, had such been his meaning, the word here used would have been *huperousios* rather than *epiousios*.

PRINCIPLES OF MISSIONARY STRATEGY, II

GILBERT BAKER

Now when we look at the Christian declaration and programme do we find that it is any more consistent than that of its rivals? Here too is an uncompromising creed and a world-embracing faith. The declaration is unwavering because, as we believe, it is related to the unchanging truth of God; it is the truth of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who loved us and gave himself for the world. The Christian concern for every man and the desire to make disciples of all nations is an integral part of the Gospel. But the point we have to consider is what is the truly Christian strategy with regard to those areas and ideologies which are apparently the least receptive to the Faith.

It is fairly obvious that the method of the Crusade is a crude and ineffective way of confronting Islam (though not everyone is convinced that this is not the correct method of dealing with communism); but for the Christian the reason why this is bad strategy is not because it is obvious or ineffective but because it is morally wrong. Thus when we speak of an indirect approach to the non-Christian world we are not descending to Macchiavellian methods but are seeking how we can most truly speak in love to our neighbours. It is not the way of love to shout slogans which have a different meaning for the hearer from what the speaker has in mind. The missionary task is not the achievement of satisfying western conscience by going through the motions of piety in some foreign field. There must be care and concern that what is presented shall be done with love and a sympathetic understanding of people's cultural and social heritage. At the same time the Church in preaching the Gospel cannot show an over-assiduous concern to smooth the path for tender consciences. The Power on which we rely is after all the Power of the Holy Spirit, and he is often unexpected in his ways and can make use of even the crudest methods of evangelism to carry out his purposes.

So everyone who has taken the trouble to find out knows that one of the ultimate hopes and aims of the Church is that the kingdoms of this world may become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. But this does not mean that everyone knows how we are going about it. Nor does it mean that we always know ourselves. In fact we find out as we go along, but all the time the Spirit is leading us with exciting and disturbing effect.

The Preparation of the Gospel.

How does the advance begin? What are the preliminary stages in such a campaign as that upon which we are embarked? First, there is clearly something which must correspond to reconnaissance—the sending out of scouts to prepare the way.

What is the “*praeparatio evangelii*” for the contemporary world? There must presumably be different manifestations of the Spirit in different places .“The Law was the schoolmaster to bring me [Paul the Jew] to Christ”. The early Fathers claimed that Plato and Aristotle performed the same functions for the classical world. But can this be said of *any* pre-Christian system? Confucian classics and Japanese traditions of chivalry might have some of the qualities which could be transfigured, and Indian Christians sometimes make the claim for some of the Hindu scriptures. It is much more doubtful to urge it for other religions or areas. This is the debate between Dr Kraemer on the one hand and such scholars as Dr C. E. Dewick or Dr Toynbee on the other—the radical break with the past or the fulfilling of the past.

This question can be answered by history. How far have people accepted the Christian Faith without preliminary scouting? Or how much has this been due to the gradual change in the climate of opinion? The experience of people in the mass is not entirely the same as that of individuals, yet there are points of comparison. The convert feels that the new life in Christ is so overwhelming that everything that has gone before it is either insignificant or evil. It is only later reflection which leads him to acknowledge that the Spirit was leading him on before his conversion experience. Similarly Indian Christians have often felt that their whole attitude towards Hinduism must be a decisive “No”, and were at first unwilling to incorporate Indian forms of art and music into Christian worship. It is only as the Young Church grows in maturity that it



appreciates the longer history through which the Spirit has guided the Indian people.

Establishing and Maintaining Contact.

Remembering constantly that his weapons are those of love, the Christian soldier's first duty on active service is to make contact. This is even more important than for the soldier whose job is to kill his foe and not to win him, for killing can be done at a distance. The Christian contact can be achieved only by going where people are. This is the reason why it is right for Christian missionaries or emissaries to keep contact with completely non-Christian people without very much direct preaching to them. This has been the policy of communities like the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, and it is the reason why Fr Huddleston in Johannesburg desired to maintain contact with young Africans even when it meant mixing in politically doubtful company. We may have to live among people for years, like the Jesuits in China or Henry Martyn in India before their confidence can be won. The need for patience is a part of the Christian vocation, but with it must go the wisdom to see what is the difference between becoming fossilized in a non-Christian environment, and the quiet biding of time, quiet yet always alert, like a lizard on a wall, to seize the opportunity when it is offered.

Defensive Action.

Sometimes, however, these Christian "probing attacks" may induce a barrage from the other side which throws the Christian forces back on the defensive. One of the most important tasks in the Younger Churches to-day is the working out of an adequate apologetic to meet the onslaught from resurgent religions and rival ideologies. Second-hand apologetics will not do. The reasoned defence of monotheism or monogamy may be taken for granted in an English Theological college (though it should not be so) but these are existential matters in Africa. The task of theology never should be to set up straw men to knock down with anachronistic arguments. There are enough real problems. How can the Church in Uganda stem the tide of defection which has revealed many shallow roots in the first generations of Christians? What are the answers to the question of African women, sharply defined by an African Christian as the dilemma of Polygamy or Prostitution? What is the

contemporary Christian apologetic in face of the ancient religions of the East and of communism in China?

It is not necessarily disastrous for Christians to be on the defensive. Some of the great moments of Church History have taken place when strategically the Church was in a weak position,—Athanasius *contra mundum*, Ramon Lull preaching to the Moslems—the Church in many parts of the world under hostile domination in World War II. It all depends on how the defence is conducted; if it is with dignity and quiet resolution it may be a turning point like Dunkirk; but if arrogance or sloth keep us from facing the real enemy then the twentieth-century Church may find itself encircled and by-passed at every point where it should be meeting human need.

An Encircling and Embracing Movement.

The great difference between the First and Second World Wars was that in the first the rival armies rapidly became locked in positional warfare from which they could not extricate themselves until the final break-through, while in the second conflict armies were again and again out-manoeuvred by panzer-divisions, air-borne troops, and island-hopping task forces which won their way to victory by encircling their unsuspecting foes. The pattern of the Church's progress has been somewhat similar. In India and in Moslem lands the Church has, as we have seen, sat down to lay a siege of love to apparently unresponsive people. But now that Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam are on the offensive there is a danger that the Christian line will be rolled up, unless there can be, under the Spirit, a new element introduced into the situation, which would by-pass the traditional hostilities. There was evidence of this in the action of Christians on the Pakistan-India border in 1947, whose indiscriminate work of relief won the respect of both Hindu and Moslem communities. The influence of Church Union in South India on evangelism is too well-attested to be ignored by the rest of the Church; in China the revolution brought about almost overnight that self-determination of the Chinese Church which missionaries had urged for years.

The events of recent years are enough to shake us all out of an accepted pattern and groove of missionary development. There was an occasion described in the Acts of Apostles when the missionary

planners had apparently made all their preparations for campaigns first in the Roman province of Asia and then in Bithynia, but in both cases they were forbidden by the Holy Spirit. Missionary strategists to-day can learn from this not to be too rigid, but aim at mobility and flexibility in the deployment of their forces, for if the Church militant is too cumbersome in its organization it will not be ready to obey the directions of the Holy Spirit when they are given.

Types of Arms.

For years the three-pronged weapon of missionary endeavour was the Church, School, and Hospital. It was in many ways effective as long as it was remembered that the Church was necessarily the centre and base on which the others depended. But in many parts of the world the School and Hospital have become increasingly independent and subject to Government control, and in China where formerly educational and medical missionary institutions always seemed to be so much more important than the struggling Church, it is in fact the Church that has survived. Again it is true that old methods are being revised in face of totally new conditions. The Christian doctor or nurse to-day has to think in terms of preventive medicine and social hygiene, or of work among refugees, or the ever closer relationship of the healing of body, mind, and spirit.

In the world of education, Church leaders must think out the implications of what happens when school or university cease to have a moral or spiritual purpose and become mere information centres for those who are preparing for a specific career. There is as great a need as ever for the assertion of Christian values in education all over the world, but the future pattern is more likely to be that of the Church offering its teachers for service in government institutions than that of the attempt to erect large and expensive schools and colleges which all too easily become an embarrassment to the young Church for whose benefit they have been founded.

Nor is the old evangelistic weapon free from criticism. Every part of the world Church has wrestled with this problem, and it is indeed necessary that every age should seek to find the right way of conveying the Gospel in the idiom of its own generation. But for missionary strategists there is the task of pooling what experience has been found fruitful—the Parochial or Diocesan Mission, well-

known in England, the Parish Life Group of the American Church, the House Church or Family Prayer Meeting at one time a feature of Church life in China, or the approach along the Christian frontier, in factory and farm or in the political councils of a nation. An alert imagination to match in the things of the spirit the incredible ingenuity and inventiveness of the human mind in the realms of science and engineering, is demanded of those who in the twentieth century would hear and act upon what the Spirit is saying to the Churches.

Relations with Allies.

One of the hardest tasks facing a military commander is to keep Allied forces working together. In all the major European and World Wars of recent history some form of unified command has usually been worked out before the end. But it requires the most patient diplomacy and firm resolve to keep people who are on the same side from forgetting to fight the enemy and fighting each other instead. The Church in the course of its long campaign has become almost fatally divided, and it sometimes appears as if the missionary objective in distant lands has been forgotten altogether in the ardent desire to uphold one form of Christian belief against another. Again and again missionaries report that a great deal of the Church's time is occupied in combating the heresy or near-heresy of other Christian bodies in the same area. This is not the place to examine the shortcomings of others, but we in the Anglican Communion may well lay seriously to heart our own divisions. For the sin of the Church of England in its missionary work is that it has sometimes been more keen on exporting Churchmanship than on preaching and living Christ.

Anglicans in East Africa are now finding how difficult it is to combine in one or more Provinces the extremes of Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic tradition which grew up in isolation from each other. Fortunately these and other barriers are being broken down, and this has been the experience of the Province of West Africa, but they illustrate the need for mutual understanding in our own Communion, and still more the absolute necessity of co-operation with the historic Christian Churches wherever they are to be found. The Church of South India has stirred both the imagination and the conscience of the Christian world, and has

raised in the sharpest form the question whether the various branches of the Church are called to die to self in order to live in closer communion with Christ and each other.

Mobility and Transport.

The bringing to bear of sufficient man-power at a strategic point is one of the important tasks of the Church to-day. It is worth remarking that in these days a great many other organizations are engaged in sending "missions" from one part of the world to the other. For the military, diplomatic, and trade missions which wing their way around the world to-day have learned from the Church that personal contact is the most effective way of passing on a message. In the end of the day it is the personal experience of a Christian which, humanly speaking, spreads the Gospel. But the sending of missionaries is not an end in itself, and the Church should guard against the sentimental attitude of regarding them as peculiarly heroic and virtuous. Many of them are; but most missionaries know very well that the real heroism and self-sacrifice come from their hard-pressed colleagues in many of the younger Churches.

There is a considerable emphasis in current missionary thought upon the modern missionary as the expert, whether in theology or bio-chemistry, or some other branch of relevant learning. But there is something a little severe and perhaps unreal about this division of labour, and without the gifts of patience and charity, the coming of the expert may well mean the old missionary domination in a new dress. But whether a missionary goes abroad as a priest or with some other gift of the Spirit he must be equipped above all with friendship, humility, and a willingness to be adaptable.

When the Japanese armies invaded China they sometimes asked the foreign missionaries they met there why missionaries should always come from the West. Why should there not be Asiatic missionaries in Asia? This question is being asked and answered again in some parts of Asia to-day where the Asian "Ecumenical Mission" has brought together many Christians from Japan, Philippines, Hong Kong, and other parts of South-East Asia who are ready to work in each other's countries. There are other manifestations of this tendency. The Church of South India aims at sending missionaries to Papua, while the Diocese of Melanesia has

sent similar help to another part of New Guinea. Indian Christians are working among their own people in East Africa. It is, however, important to mark the difference between the work of liaison and the work of evangelism, for they can easily be mistaken for the same thing. Indeed it is probably the task of the Anglican Church in particular to make it clear that the purpose of the Ecumenical Movement is not a progress from conference to conference but a concerted effort under God to win the men and women of this day and age for Christ.

The Problem of Supply.

If the Gospel is to be spread by the personal contacts to which we have referred, the men and women who make them must be properly supplied. They must first of all be trained in the knowledge of the Bible and the essentials of Christian Faith. They must be able to put into the hands of those whom they meet the treasures of Christian literature and relevant writing on these themes, if possible in a language understood by those whom they seek to teach. Furthermore the Christian messenger must be able to find the spiritual resources for replenishment. Clearly this means that when the Christian message is spoken it must also be accompanied with the sacraments and all the resources of the spiritual life. This is a matter which claims the attention of the Church's leaders. There is still too much evidence of missionaries who are so overburdened that they get stale, of those who suffer breakdowns, and those who do not complete more than one term of service overseas. If they are not well enough supplied physically and spiritually they cannot do their work, and it would seem that all over the Anglican Communion, especially in the Younger Churches, the clergy in particular suffer from one or both kinds of malnutrition. It was Napoleon who declared that an army moves on its belly, and the Christian forces for their part can only move forward if they are regularly supplied with the Bread of Life.

Modern warfare demands constant co-ordination and communication with headquarters. But as the Christian faces his battle the great difference is that his Headquarters is not infected by human frailty. The frailty is in our lack of faith in what sometimes seem to be astonishing orders. Our Lord's first disciples sometimes followed him in fear because they could not understand where he was leading. But they did not make up their minds in advance that

they knew better. For all their weakness they were ready to trust him. Jesus Christ our Leader does not tell us all his plans, for there is an element of surprise in his campaign. It is for us to overcome our own surprise at the leading of the Spirit, for we must be ready if he wills to follow the way of the Cross as the only sure road to victory.

(*Concluded.*)

CHURCH AND STATE

C. H. SISSON

I

IN THE classic controversy between Church and State the State has been mainly concerned to assert the independence of its own authority. In our day its apologists have several times shaken themselves to be rid of the last shackles and in doing so they have been, not the prophets of enlightenment they announce themselves to be, but the respectable fag-end of a considerable tradition. In one respect, however, they have shown what would almost amount to originality, if it were not absurd to speak of novelty in connection with a quarrelsome marriage in the course of which everything possible has happened. While usually disowning all theology, they have been insistent that, so far from merely seeking more power for the State, they are deeply concerned for the spiritual good of the Church. If they were wolves, one would say that they came in sheep's clothing. They express sympathy with the Church because it has to suffer a Prime Minister not necessarily bound by its rule having a hand in the appointment of bishops, and in general because it is entangled with the affairs of men. This is a trick, we must admit, that has been learned from some in the Church. The fate of the 1928 Prayer Book—which in retrospect does not necessarily seem to have been a bad one—causes many churchmen to speak a little rashly about the control of the State over the Church. It is hardly surprising that the apologists of the State should say : If you want your sanctity, you can have it. While Milton could not praise a fugitive or cloistered virtue there are many who prefer it that way.

It is evidence of the complexity of the problem of the relationship of Church and State that some of the basic arguments of those who would like to see disestablishment because they do not like the Church might have been taken direct from one who was not only a churchman but the author of a classic defence of the Establishment. Warburton's case was that Church and State should each be

sovereign in its own field and independent, but united by "free convention and mutual compact".¹ Such was the nature of the union, he contended, which produced "a Church by Law established". The established religion was protected by the State not for its truth but for its utility. Warburton assumed that truth and public utility coincided, and that the civil magistrate would therefore "promote truth in religion". In the high spirits of his apology Warburton forgot that it was the statesman's view of utility which he had declared to be congruent with the churchman's view of truth. Behind this optimism was a basic principle which is now the common currency of those who are indifferent to the Church or against her. "The care of the State", Warburton says, "extends only to the body and its concerns, and the care of the Church only to the soul." The principle is entirely unchristian; the bishop could have learned as much from the words of administration. It asserts the existence of two co-existent realms, with governments quite separate so that the activities of the one need not worry the other. It is almost as if we were back with the Manichees; certainly we are, precisely, with those who wish the Church well so long as she merely carries on innocent Sunday entertainments and does not meddle with the affairs of the world.

Those who are anxious that the Church should not impinge on public life have a justification in some of our popular ideas about sovereignty and in certain aspects of our constitutional practice. The popular notion of sovereignty is that all power resides in the people. It is a principle which sounds well at the hustings and in the press. To any instructed person it is merely one of the several theories of politics, with a definite and traceable history like the others, which contain a part of the truth but no more. In its modern form it has come to us through Locke, Rousseau, and the French Revolution, and it has gained a little colour since from an entirely opposed theory, the Marxist. It hangs in the air now rather as a sentiment than as a theory, and it is perhaps as a sentiment that it is most respectable. So far as it invites us to pay attention to the views of the people at large it is acceptable and, moreover, politically indispensable. So far as it suggests that the "ideals and desires"² of the majority are a criterion of truth it is nonsense, or means that the liberty given to minorities, in a democracy, to express their views is merely nefarious. A churchman, moreover, will inevitably reflect that "the devices and desires of our own hearts" are not

exactly the best of guides. The support given to those who want to keep the Church out of public life by certain aspects of our constitutional practice is more solid. Our administration operates on a balance between the laws as they are and the popular pressures to change them. An existing law has to be so administered as to make life possible for the minister who has to answer for it in Parliament. If a law is such that it cannot be administered in a way that can be defended in the House, it has to be repealed or amended. The Queen's ministers, and the officials who work under them, have the paramount duty of holding the country together and ensuring the continuity of the administration. Their constant concern is to avoid trouble. If pressure for certain action is strong and continuous they are bound in the end to bend, lest the administration break. Their essential characteristic is pliability, not love of the truth. They use as much truth as they need to do their job. It is quite a lot, of a certain kind. A high degree of consistency and accuracy is necessary if one is not to be caught out in the game of recriminations. But the intrinsic value of what is said or done does not matter to the politician or official as such. This is not a peculiarity of our times, though it appears to be so when men compare, as they are apt to do, the practices of the present with the principles handed down from the past. It is the point Warburton has before him when he says that the State will protect religion for its utility.

For many the assertion that religion was useful to the State would merely raise a laugh. They have great difficulty in imagining that it could be useful for anything. That is partly due to inattention to what goes on in churches and what psychologically happens in prayer and worship. It is only a hasty and superficial observation which could yield the conclusion that something real happens when a man drinks a pint of beer at a pub and nothing real when he goes to church. And in the recorded history of man, if inns and ale-houses have had their agreeableness and usefulness, temples and churches have had their importance. We need not fear the intelligence of those who attach no importance to religion, though we may blame ourselves for the defects in our apologetics which have failed to make many people see even what is under their noses. One might, however, admit that there was "something in" this business of religion, while maintaining that its usefulness to the State was nothing at all. The Erastians of the eighteenth century

could think of it as binding the consciences of men, and there will always be those who have the impertinence to tolerate the Church because they think their property will be safer in a community of hands not given to picking and stealing, and those who hate religion but love respectability, of which they cannot believe the Church to be the enemy. One might argue with truth that the Church runs a tremendous social service far more cheaply than any government department would do it; one might argue that certain of the Church's doctrines are worth promulgating merely for the usefulness that a sceptical social worker might see in them. Even if these arguments succeeded individually they would, taken together, hardly convince anyone that the State should recognize the Church. The condescending answer would be that there are lots of other voluntary organizations which are equally worthy.

In putting the Church back among the other voluntary organizations, those who want disestablishment are able to pretend that they are concerned that it should live more in accordance with the objects for which it was founded; and those objects, they wrongly say, were of such a nature that the Church was concerned only with a Greek thing called the soul and not with the body as it is known in Westminster and Wigan. They are, moreover, grounding themselves on a notion of sovereignty which is more comprehensive in the support it has than in the truth it contains. Further, they are reasonably finding comfort in the constitutional practice of listening for the loudest and most persistent voice and then obeying it. In all, they have a good, tough, popular case, of the kind that often settles things in practice. If we were dealing with the political crisis of a decade it might be good enough. But what is proposed in disestablishment is the abolition of a relationship which in principle is as old as Constantine or, in these islands, as Anglo-Saxon England where bishops and nobles sat jointly in the Witan.³ There are those for whom the very antiquity of an institution is a reason for destroying it, but, happily, they have rarely been numerous enough to carry the day among the English.

2

IT IS unfortunate for the solution of this problem of the relationship of Church and State that we can hold out no hope to our opponents that the Church will disappear. If we could give that assurance, there would certainly be those who would be willing to

extend a generous toleration during the interim period. The Church will, however, always continue to make the same claims as it has always made and to proclaim the same gospel. There can be no expectation that it will be more accommodating in future so that the nature of the problem might change. It will continue to assert that it is different in kind from other voluntary organizations and it will refuse to go away and give harmless entertainments of which nothing is heard in the outside world. It will not even consent to reserve its gospel for its members, as Freemasons do the oddities they indulge in. These things sound so unconciliatory as to be out of place in a temporizing, politicians' world. But they are facts which the most pliant of politicians will have always to reckon with. The martyrs are there for proof. The fact that the Church will go on and will have its martyrs is by no means adduced as an argument for it remaining established. Nor is it suggested that anyone would be martyred in defence of establishment nor that death on such an occasion would have any claim to be considered martyrdom. We know that disestablishment is a thing that would be welcomed by many devout churchmen. It is the thesis of this article that they are ill-advised. And it is the purpose of the second part of this article to indicate some reasons which should make agnostic supporters of the State as well as churchmen hesitate before committing themselves.

The relations of Church and State which make up Establishment are small things as seen against the background of the total activity of either, but they are of great significance. The State, which long fought for a certain control over the Church, though it now sets little store by it, has the right to summon Convocation, to hear appeals from Church courts, to nominate bishops, and to "make laws as to Church Discipline, to unite with Convocation in dealing by legislation with matters of faith and substance, and to adjust the administration of Church endowments".⁴ It is curious that, in an age which above all others has been marked by an extension of State control, this one instance of a shedding of powers exercised for centuries should find such hearty recommendation. The privileges of the Establishment are few but prominent. There is the obligation of the sovereign to belong to the Church, the right of the Archbishop to crown the sovereign, and the right of certain bishops to sit in the House of Lords. It is easier to understand the contemporary objections to these privileges than the desire to see

the State shed its powers over the Church. The objection to the bishops in the Lords might take the form of the question: Why should one voluntary organization, rather than another, have members in the Upper House? The obligation of the sovereign to be a churchman might present itself to the popular mind as a violence to his conscience, for it is not to be supposed that anyone in the twentieth century could possibly benefit by such chains. To abolish the Coronation would certainly spoil the people's fun, but perhaps it would be proposed that Westminster Abbey would anyway be a nice place for a show of that sort and that any bits of the service which meant anything could be taken out by a vote in Parliament.

The significance of the fact that the Church will go on whatever the State says about it is this: that so long as the State goes on it will have to reckon with the Church, and the question is not, therefore, whether certain problems of either of the parties would be simplified by the disappearance of the other but, assuming that both go on, what are their relationships to be? They cannot escape having some. It must not be assumed that the only alternative to the totality of the present arrangements is complete disestablishment. "The Establishment", says Sir Lewis Dibdin, "has survived so many modifications that, whatever we may think, it would be rash to assert that the irreducible minimum has now been nearly reached."⁵ The basic question must be whether it is better for the relationship between Church and State to be defined so that both parties know where they stand, or to leave it to be settled *ad hoc* whenever the two make contact, as they must continue to do, on the pretence that the vast and ancient organization of the historic Church in England is no more than just another voluntary organization with private objects which amuse its members.

Those whose predilections are for this pretence would do well to reflect on the fact that the problem centres upon the Church of England because that is the most numerous and most deep-rooted ecclesiastical organization in England. The problem does not arise in the case of the Nonconformist churches because, with one exception, they are ancillary and in the main derivative. The Church of England in a sense fights their battles for them, and is the voice of Christianity in the State. If that voice were not heard, other churches might have the satisfaction of knowing that their mother had been placed by the State on an equality with themselves, but it is difficult to believe that they would not thereby be

weakened. There are few Methodists, one imagines, who would be glad to see the sovereign profess no religion, or enter upon his office with a mere affirmation of good intentions. Few Christians of any kind would wish to see the proceedings of Parliament open without a prayer. The one Nonconformist body which might have cause for satisfaction is the Roman Church.

It is worth considering for a moment the politics of the Missal.⁶ There are prayers provided with the design of undoing the work of the Reformation and no doubt, if that work were undone, the English State would qualify for a more central place in the Missal than it now occupies. The Introit for 4 May (The English and Welsh Martyrs) is no doubt a bemoaning of our reformed condition: "O God, the heathen have broken into thy inheritance." The Collect which follows is more specific and recalls those who were "champions of the true faith *and* of the papacy" (my italics), and the third collect roundly asserts that "from the beginning" of their church the English were "the dowry of the blessed virgin Mary and subjects of Peter". A Postcommunion prayer for the same day, said, like the third collect, to be "For England", describes "this nation of ours" as "illustrious for its ancient loyalty to the apostle Peter" and concludes, in case there should be any ambiguity in the former reference, with a petition that users of the Missal may be strengthened in obedience to the Apostolic See. More specifically political is the note, among the Bidding Prayers for Good Friday, under the heading "For the Emperor", which explains that this prayer is "omitted, the Holy Roman Empire being vacant". Users of the Missal are apparently to count the restoration of the Empire among their political aspirations, even though they may now omit the remembrance of it from their prayers. This vestige of the better days of the Roman polity is of interest as a succinct demonstration of the patience of the Curia, and of its political tenacity. An Englishman accustomed to the Book of Common Prayer will recognize in the rubric a political disposition exactly parallel with that taken up by his own church in relation to the English crown. The only odd thing, to the Englishman, will be precisely that the Missal, even as edited for use in this country, should take that disposition in relation to someone else's crown, which not only does not now exist but never at any time had the slightest connection with our own or meant anything to it.

The Roman Church is far from having abandoned its political

objectives. In this country it plays the rôle of a minority biding its time. If it were as strong in England as our Church now is, the State would be forced to define more or less regularly its relationship to it. The State would, ultimately, have not merely to define relationships with its own subjects in their church but with a foreign power. That is, from the national point of view, the most significant difference between the Roman Church and our own. "If we lived in Plato's commonwealth", said Bramhall,⁷ "where every man did his duty", there could be no danger in following the Pope. But the seventeenth century could remember Englishmen being relieved of their duty of common loyalty by a bishop in Rome. It was no accident that the Canons of 1604 began with the assertion of Royal Supremacy. It might be said that the authors of the Draft Canons of 1947 showed a lack of historical sense in not following a similar arrangement. It is popularly supposed that these political questions are dead, but they are not. Even the most outrageous of papal political claims have found apologists in our own time, and since the Reformation Rome has emphasized her apartness still further by the formal assertion of papal infallibility. In the seventeenth century it was still possible for a devout Frenchman, a member of the Roman Church, to write that the Jesuits had rendered themselves guilty not only of a heresy "but of a manifest impiety, in levelling God with a creature, and asking us to render to the mere word of a man (the Pope) the same devotion as is due to the eternal word".⁸ In our day a Frenchman, and one of the most enlightened, can still defend the old thesis of the Elizabethan Jesuits that excommunication of a Prince by Rome relieves the subject of all duty of obedience, and that a Pope is indeed a temporal sovereign because if he were not he could not avoid being a subject.⁹ In 1789 English Roman Catholics could lay a protestation before Parliament declaring that they acknowledged no infallibility in the Pope.¹⁰ They would not dare to show such independence now nor, since the Roman Church, once wrong, is infallibly wrong, will they ever dare again. They have their politics, however subduedly for the present, and they are not in their obedience bound to England.

They have their politics: need we really be ashamed to have ours? Embodied in the Book of Common Prayer is a simple loyalty to the Crown, which itself is further bound to us by the obligation on the sovereign to be a member of the Church. The making of the State Prayers optional, at Morning and Evening Prayer, in the Book

of 1928, was a defection which only the intervention of Parliament (however motivated) prevented becoming part of the law of the Church as it has, regrettably, become part of its practice.

¹ William Warburton, *The Alliance between Church and State, or the Necessity and Equity of an Established Religion and a Test-Law Demonstrated*, 1736.

² Cf. Mr S. T. Swingler's Question in the House (*Hansard*, 15 November 1955, Col. 199).

³ S. L. Greenslade: *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius*, p. 80.

⁴ See Sir Lewis Dibdin, *Establishment in England*, 1932, pp. 115-6.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 116.

⁶ The references are to *The Missal in Latin and English, Being the text of the Missale Romanum with English rubrics and a new translation*, 1949.

⁷ See John Bramhall, *The Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated*.

⁸ See Jean Racine, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal*.

⁹ See Jacques Maritain, *Primaute du Spirituel*, 1927, *passim*.

¹⁰ See H. Burn-Murdoch, *The Development of the Papacy*, 1954, p. 399.

F. W. ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON: A REVIEW

A. W. BALLARD

ORIGINALITY is rare in the world of affairs. Disraeli had it in the sphere of politics, and by his attacks on Peel exposed the latter's deficiency in this quality. In the Anglican pulpit there have been shining and illustrious preachers, but it is fair to say that originality is the characteristic of Robertson of Brighton.

The most diverse critics have agreed on this estimate. One of the earliest is Jowett of Balliol, who, as a contributor to the much discussed *Essays and Reviews* (1860) wrote:

"It may be said that originality is the gift of few; no Church can expect to have, not a hundred but ten, such preachers as Robertson or Newman."

Another tribute is that of the late Lord Oxford and Asquith (in his *Memories and Reflections*, p. 229):

"During the first half of the last century the highest level of preaching in the Church of England was reached in a moderate-sized chapel in a fashionable watering place by F. W. Robertson of Brighton. The originality of his thought, his insight into human nature, his rare felicity in the choice of words, illustrations and metaphors, the independence of his point of view, the impressiveness of his appeals, never tainted for a moment with claptrap or maudlin rhetoric—all these qualities were set off by the gifts of eye, voice, gesture, which only a speaker of the highest order has at his command."

This latter is a cogent testimony, for it ought to be superfluous to add that hardly a greater authority on the magic and power of English has existed in our time than Asquith unless it be Sir Winston Churchill.

Robertson's *Sermons* have become a classic. Two eulogies, perhaps not widely known, deserve to be recorded. The first is by Robert Louis Stevenson :

"You will think me an illiterate dog: I am, for the first time, reading *Robertson's Sermons*. I do not know how to express how

much I think of them. If by any chance you should be as illiterate as I, and not know them, it is worth while curing the defect."

The second is from Dean Stanley :

"Once in travelling from the south of France to Paris, we entered the railway at Mâcon, and found, coiled up on the opposite side of the railway carriage, a rough, shaggy, way-worn traveller fast asleep. He was, with us, the only occupant of the carriage. After a time he lifted up his head and began to speak to us. He was a wild, revolutionary, unbelieving surgeon who had been attached to a regiment in Algeria, and who was then on his way to the Army in Mexico. We entered into conversation which lasted through the live-long day till we reached Paris. In the course of his conversation he asked—not knowing that I was a clergyman—whether I had ever known or read the sermons of Frederick Robertson; he had himself fallen in with a copy, had been struck with them, and he was eager to know anything that I could tell him about them. We parted at Paris—he went to Mexico, and I have since lost all trace of him. This was one end of the scale. On the next day, in Paris, I went as usual to see a man whom in his best days I greatly respected and loved—Augustin Cochin—who afterwards became Prefect of Versailles in the troubles which succeeded the Franco-German war, and who died of the fatigues which in that war had fallen to his lot. He was a devout Catholic, liberal indeed, and open to all kinds of questioning about England and Protestantism; of the school of Montalembert and Father Gatry. He, on the occasion to which I refer, asked if I could tell him anything about an extraordinary preacher whose name was Frederick Robertson. Thus, in the course of forty-eight hours, I had evidence of the effect produced in two extremes of French society, and that by an English preacher."

Let Stopford Brooke describe the impression created by Robertson's preaching :

"He preached for the first time in Trinity Chapel on August 15th, 1847. His sermon on a favourite subject—'The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified'—at once awoke criticism and interest. . . . Thoughtful and eager-minded men came in, by degrees, from all parts of Brighton, attracted not only by his earnest eloquence, but by his original thought and clear reasoning. He clothed in fresh brightness the truths which, because their garments were worn out, man had ignorantly imagined to be exhausted. He drew out the living

inspiration of the Bible, and especially of the historical portions of the Old Testament. He made men feel the life which ran through the doctrinal portions of the Prayer Book. Whatever he touched sprang into being; and many of his hearers entered on a new existence. Other men who were engaged in the great questions of society and of the world, were drawn to his ministry by the wide knowledge which he showed of past history, and by the force by which he applied Christianity to the social problems of the present age. Young men eagerly listened to his delicate analysis of the human heart, and of those difficulties of religious thought which, even now presenting themselves for solution, had only then begun to agitate the mind of England. Others of a lighter cast came to enjoy the imagery and the rapid rush of clear language. Servants and working-men came to hear with reverence and affection a man who spoke as if his whole being were in the words he used, and who seemed to sympathize with their lives as none had ever done before."

Again :

"To all in spiritual difficulty, in doubt, or in trouble—to all whom sorrow has touched or whom suffering has enfeebled—to all those spirits whose sensitive organization has made life so subtle in its varieties of feeling, so difficult to live, owing to the various aspects in which to such persons both action and thought present themselves—he will always be the comforter, and the guide of the way to the highest Comfort. To all who are perplexed with casuistry, with the solution of peculiar cases of moral action in which two duties appear to clash, or in which of two duties the higher is to be discovered and chosen—to all who wish, by the accurate performance of the smallest duties of life, to reach the starting-point of the higher life where Christ replaces the Law in our hearts by the Gospel, and coerced obedience to the moral law is succeeded by the willing obedience which love renders to a righteous Father—Robertson will always be a helper and a director."

The *Sermons*—their very titles attract—must be read to be appreciated. All are of permanent interest, but let two be selected for comment.

(a) "Christ's judgement concerning inheritance" (Luke 12. 13-15) was broadcast in 1930. It contains plain speaking on national covetousness, but it should not be separated from its sequel, "The Message of the Church to Men of Wealth". For a sermon to retain

its freshness and applicability nearly eighty years after delivery shows that Robertson's attitude to economic questions is interesting at the present time. Robertson opposed Socialism, as such, in his sermons and speeches. "I do not think", he remarked, "that the attempts which begin with the society instead of the individual, will any of them solve the question. The latter, the Christian way, some day or other will. Meanwhile, I rejoice at all efforts from the world's side: even failures teach us something." That the root of the matter was in him is shown by this passage: "Assuredly, protest against Kingsley who will, he stood on a deep, awful truth, God will yet take count of the selfishness of will: and his quarrel has yet to be fought out." (Kingsley had been inhibited from preaching in the London diocese, on account of a "political" sermon. But the Bishop (Blomfield) cancelled the inhibition after he had perused a copy of the sermon.)

(b) The sermon on Absolution (Luke 5. 21 ". . . who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone?")

The French Protestant theologian, Edmond Dehault de Pressensé (1824-91), comments rather complacently that Robertson was no sacerdotalist. This question-begging epithet is usually left undefined, and Pressensé is no exception. He speaks, of course, from the standpoint of Protestant individualism, which disowns a ministerial priesthood. Robertson's position is made abundantly clear by quotation from this sermon. The language is plain and unconditional. The inference is irresistible that Pressensé either chose to ignore this testimony or was not acquainted with it. In any case, his contention is meaningless. These are Robertson's words:

"Absolution, the prerogative of our humanity, is represented by a formal act of the Church. Much controversy and angry bitterness have been spent on the absolution put by the Church of England into the lips of her ministers—I cannot think with justice, if we try to get at the root of these words of Christ. The priest proclaims forgiveness authoritatively as the organ of the congregation—as the voice of the Church, in the name of Man and God. For human nature represents God. The Church represents what human nature is and ought to be. The minister represents the Church. He speaks, therefore, in the name of our Godlike, human nature. He declares a divine fact; he does not create it. There is no magic in his absolution: he can no more forgive whom God has not forgiven, by the formula of absolution, or reverse by the formula of ex-

communication the pardon of him whom God has absolved, than he can transfer a demon into an angel by the formula of baptism. He declares what every one has a right to declare, and ought to declare by his lips and by his conduct; but, being a minister, he declares it authoritatively in the name of every Christian who by his Christianity is a priest to God; he specializes what is universal; as in baptism, he seals the universal Sonship in the individual by name, saying, 'The Sonship with which Christ has redeemed all men, I hereby proclaim for this child,' so by absolution he specializes the universal fact of the love of God to those who are listening then and there, saying 'The Love of God the Absolver, I authoritatively proclaim to be yours.' In the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, the Church of England puts into the lips of her ministers words quite unconditional: 'I absolve thee from all thy sins'. You know that passage is constantly objected to as Romish and superstitious. I love the Church of England because she has dared to claim her inheritance—because she has courage to assert herself as what she ought to be—God's representative on earth. She says to her minister, Stand there before a darkened spirit, on whom the shadows of death have begun to fall: in human flesh and blood representing the Invisible,—with words of human life making credible the Love Eternal. Say boldly, I am here to declare not a perhaps, *but a fact*: I forgive thee in the name of Humanity. And so far as Humanity represents Deity, that forgiveness is a type of God's. She does not put into her ministers' lips words of incantation. He cannot bless whom God has not blessed—he cannot curse whom God has not cursed. If the Son of Absolution be there, his absolution will rest. If you have ever tried the slow and apparently hopeless task of ministering to a heart diseased, and binding up the wound that *will* bleed afresh, to which no assurances can give comfort, because they are not authoritative, it must have crossed your mind that such a power as that which the Church of England claims, if it were believed, is exactly the remedy you want."

This passage has been quoted at length because it is an effective explanation of an absolution which is paralleled by nothing in any of the Reformed Confessions. The quotation certainly disposes of Pressense's statement.

Robertson's fame is posthumous. Multitudes have been moved by him as by no other teacher, and there is that in his sermons which may well keep them alive for another century. He has become

famous in both English and non-English lands. This is his secret: "Of one thing I have become distinctly conscious—that my mode of life, my whole heart's expression is 'None but Christ'—the *mind* of Christ, to feel as he felt, to judge the world and to estimate the world's maxims as He judged and estimated."

The years (103) that have passed since his death, at the early age of thirty-seven, make the old-time royal lament most apposite even to-day: "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?"

NOTES ON AN EVANSTON REPORT

WHEN the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches met at Evanston in August 1954, the delegates were divided into six sections and to each a special subject for discussion was allotted; that of the Faith and Order Section being "Our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Churches". The Section Reports were presented to the Assembly, and by it were sent to the member Churches for consideration and comment.

In response to this communication it was the duty of the Council for Ecumenical Co-operation to take appropriate action on behalf of the Church of England, and it decided to call together a group of theologians to consider the Faith and Order Report. The Bishop of Chelmsford agreed to act as Chairman and the other members were Professor John Burnaby, the Reverend Christopher Evans, Dr Richard Hanson, Professor H. A. Hodges, Professor G. W. H. Lampe, Professor Dennis Nineham, and Dr J. A. T. Robinson. In the Introduction to the Report prepared by them they describe their exact status as follows: "We are a group of Anglican theologians and as such we have given our own views. Where no qualifying words are used it can be taken that we are all in sufficient general agreement at least not to express dissent. The World Council will no doubt understand the difficulties there would be in obtaining an official view of the Church of England, and that to do so would be bound to take a considerable time, if indeed it were possible. While the views expressed in our Report may not be acceptable to all theologians in our Church, we hope they will give a reasonable indication of trends of thought among the broad majority."

The remainder of this article contains the views of the group on the Faith and Order Report.

WE WISH to begin by saying that we consider this Report to be in general of great value. The Report from Amsterdam appeared to be largely a statement of facts about the likenesses and differences between the Churches. This Report goes much further in tackling

the doctrinal issues involved. We welcome the declarations: that the Church's unity is grounded in Christ; that in Christ and by virtue of its divine calling the Church already, in spite of its divisions, possesses a true unity; and that its unity will be fully realized when the eschatological hope of the summing up of all things in Christ is fulfilled, but that in the meantime the Church is both united and divided.

We want to emphasize our general agreement with the Report, because there is one comment that we wish to make upon it, which, if it were taken outside the context of such agreement, might appear harsh and separatist. We therefore affirm that in line with general Anglican teaching we believe that there can be schisms within the Church; and nothing we are about to say is intended to imply that everybody who disagrees with the Anglican doctrine is necessarily entirely wrong while we are entirely right. We welcome wholeheartedly the growing tendency not to see everything in terms of black and white, and the desire of the Churches to reconsider their own position and that of others, which has been at once the cause and consequence of the growth of the ecumenical movement.

It will therefore be understood that it is not in any sense through lack of enthusiasm for the movement or a desire to press the claims of our own Church that we make the following comment. We are disposed to feel that there is an omission from the Report which is liable to make it misleading. In any document of the World Council it would be natural to expect an emphasis on unity, which, while it can never be an over-emphasis, might nevertheless lead to an undervaluation of other aspects of the Church's life. We think that there are passages in the Report that suggest that the Church's duty of safeguarding the truths of its faith is not sufficiently recognized.

On page 3 there are references to New Testament passages on the unity of the Church. But there are other passages which are relevant to the subject matter of this Report. For example St Paul referring to false brethren (Gal. 2. 5) says, "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour that the truth of the gospel might continue with you". The incident to which he refers was of course one of discord within the Church and not of schism. But the need not to give place even though it leads to schism is evidenced by other passages of the Epistles (e.g. 1 Tim. 1. 6, 7; 4. 1, 2; 6. 3-5; 2 Tim. 2. 16-18; 3. 1-9; Tit. 1. 10-16; 3. 10, 11; 1 John 2. 18, 19; 4. 1-6; 5. 10). Those who "went out from us but were not of us", in

the words of St John, had been members of the Church and presumably considered themselves still to be so. There was a conflict of beliefs, perhaps sincerely held, and the breaking away of a body of Christians. St John believed that those who thought with him were right and were the Church, and those that broke away were wrong and were no longer members of the Church.

We believe that such a situation did arise then, and to put it at its lowest, may have arisen in the history of the Church since New Testament times. It should therefore be recognized that unity may have to be achieved by exclusion as well as by inclusion. There are perhaps faint suggestions to the contrary in the Report. For instance at the bottom of page 7, it is stated that certain bodies believed this and that. It is never expressly or implicitly suggested that some might have been right, and the remainder of the paragraph rather indicates that everybody was partially wrong. This does not seem to us to accord with New Testament teaching. It is not so much that there is any express statement that we wish to challenge as that there is a misleading implication that could easily be drawn from the Report. This implication is strengthened by the references to "repentance". On page 8 we appear to be told that we involve ourselves in sin at the very point where we take our stand, and honestly take our stand, on conviction. The meaning seems to be that our convictions themselves are infected with sin, because we are too disposed to value what is ours just because it is ours, and so mistake accidentals for essentials. The Report then goes on to say: "Churches in their actual historical situations" may "reach a point of readiness and a time of decision" where "their witnessing may require obedience unto death. They may then have to be prepared to offer up some of their accustomed, inherited forms of life in uniting with other Churches without complete certainty as to all that will emerge from the step of faith." We miss here the safeguard that Churches have no business to give up their accustomed inherited forms of life except where they have a clear conviction that this is what they are called upon to do, and they must not give up those inherited forms of life which they regard as matters of principle unless and until they undergo an intellectual conversion and change of mind on these points of principle.

This point, which could with advantage have been made here, is made on page 8. But if it is accepted it raises the question in what way ought we to think of our divisions with repentance. We wish

to say at once that we are in complete sympathy with the attitude of mind behind this passage. Certainly we ought to feel grief and horror at our divisions. Certainly we ought to repent of our own sins in connection with our divisions, our complacency in their continuance, our prejudice towards and intolerance of other Christian bodies. But ought we to repent of the fact of our divisions?

It is easy for all to agree that sin has been the cause of schism. But we are not convinced that the act of schism or an act that tends towards schism is necessarily a sin. In a particular sinful set of circumstances it might be the right thing to do. If so, repentance ought not to be required for it. Further, the sins which resulted in particular historical schism were the sins of particular historical people and not ours, though no doubt they sprang from the human situation which we all share. As has been said, we might believe that the sin did not lie with our own predecessors but with others. Supposing, however, that we did believe that their sins were at least partly responsible for the schism, ought we to be asked to repent of those sins? We doubt whether there is any authority in scripture or reason for such a proposition. Certainly there is an air of unreality about the use of the word, and it is liable to perplex and mislead the ordinary reader.

But even though it may be unreal to ask us to repent of "our understandings of God's will for his Church", yet we can all admit that these understandings may, indeed must, have been impoverished by our separation from our fellow Christians. Wherever we believe the sins to lie, we ought to ask whether these sins are still being committed, and, if not, whether their consequence in division is still necessary. As Anglicans, we would not consider differences of understanding alone as necessarily leading to disunity. Our Church is the obvious example of a "manifest" unity which embraces a great variety of "understandings". Can we conceive any state of outward Church unity within which there would not in fact be at least as much divergence in individual understanding of the common faith?

We now turn to particular passages in the Report.

In connection with section 1A, we have the feeling that the views put forward are too exclusively Christological. In the high priestly prayer Jesus prays: "As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." There is a Theological unity as well as

a Christological unity. Israel is one, as God is one, and the Church is the true Israel.

We are not entirely happy about the application of the phrase "*simul justus et peccator*" to the Church on page 4. We agree that there is a sense in which it is a helpful analogy, but it should not be used to suggest that schism will necessarily continue to be a part of the life of the Church on earth till the end of time. While it is hard to contemplate a future here in which there is not some measure of disunity and even discord, we imagine that there are few, if any, in the World Council who believe that this disunity will inevitably be expressed by schisms, and therefore care should be taken that words should not be used in such a way that they could be so interpreted. Further, the phrase suggests that "*justus*" and union are necessarily connected and "*peccator*" and disunion, which is a proposition to which we could not assent without important reservations for reasons already given.

In the first paragraphs of 1B and of 11, the words "manifest" and "manifested" are used. We are a little uncertain what precisely they imply, if any strict meaning is meant to be attached to them at all. The sentence over which we felt particular difficulty was: "But when diversity disrupts the manifest unity of its Body, then it changes its quality and becomes sinful division." The point already mentioned in connection with "repentance" arises here also. We take it that in general "manifest unity" is intended to mean organic unity and common obedience to common leaders, and that it implies communion. If this is correct the basic problem of a "manifest unity" seems to be that of orders.

Some of us have hesitations over the last paragraph of page 8. The first word used is "Concretely", and perhaps it might have been better if the ideas had in fact been expressed more concretely. There is a certain obscurity about some of the words used—for instance "witnessing" in the third line—but the main difficulties arise over the phrase "to die with Christ". Does it refer to, say, the South India Scheme, or to hypothetical future situations? If so, could they be a little more closely defined?

The proposals on pages 10 and 11 are important and should be studied. In paragraph vi we found considerable difficulty over the meaning of "the ministry of the laity for Christian unity". Could it be elucidated? It is paragraph (v) that raises the most important theological issues for our Church and therefore we have thought it

advisable to concentrate on it at the expense of the other proposals to which the particular contribution of our Church is likely to be less important.

The Anglican Church believes that the sacrament of baptism incorporates the baptized person into the Body of Christ, provided that the intention is right, that is if the intention is to do what the Church means by baptism.

It also accepts the view of Stephen as against Cyprian that a schismatic baptism is a valid baptism. We affirm that baptism is into the whole Church and not into, say, the Church of England. It is incorporation into the undivided heavenly Church. It is also incorporation into a Church that is on earth divided. Such a situation was never contemplated by the writers of the New Testament, and its implications with regard to the consequences that flow from baptism are difficult to assess.

The Report asks us to examine "the implications of the one Baptism for our sharing in the one Eucharist". The attitude generally adopted by the Anglican Church is that there should not be intercommunion except with Churches with an episcopally ordained ministry. We are unanimously agreed that there are dangers in this attitude in that it has been formulated too much in the light of legal rather than theological categories of thought. The clear-cut division between episcopal and non-episcopal ministries, though itself one of major theological significance, has, we believe, become a legal obstacle behind which we can shelter from any other theological thinking in regard to this issue. If we cannot anyhow have intercommunion until the question of orders is settled, we are able to absolve ourselves meanwhile from thinking out the theological conditions in which this becomes less sinful than separate communions.

We believe that the question of inter-communion ought to be re-examined theologically in the wider context of the life of the Church. The doctrines of the Eucharist, of baptism, of confirmation, of orders, would all be relevant but no aspect of any of them should be regarded as automatically decisive, but each should be seen in its place within the larger whole. Only when this has been done shall we be able to have a clear understanding of our own position and to interpret it effectively to other Churches. We do not wish to make any forecast about what the result of such an examination would be. We might be confirmed in our present attitude, or we might

modify it towards greater relaxation or greater rigidity. The conclusion we have reached is a confession of ignorance.

But in spite of this confession, we would like to say something about our own provisional views. Over the question of whether intercommunion should be regarded as a means of attaining unity, we are divided.

Some of us hold that we have a unity that is rooted in our membership in Christ and that as the sacraments are effective signs of that membership we can hope to attain unity only through that growth in faith—union with Christ which is mediated sacramentally. To these members of our group the conception of intercommunion as the goal of reunion rather than as the means to it, suggests that unity is something man-made, something agreed round the table, rather than grounded in our membership in Christ, and also assumes that a certain form of order ought to be given a certain theological priority to the Gospel sacrament of the eucharist.

One of the members who takes this view is Dr Robinson, and we wish to submit for consideration a memorandum¹ which he prepared for us as it contains a particular proposal, namely con-celebration, which appears to us to be of great interest.

There are others of us who would agree if it were a question of orders in isolation that was involved, but consider that the Anglican view of orders expresses a deep reality in the life of the Church. The Church partakes of the life of Christ and possesses a unity that is the unity of the Body of Christ. Its organization as a community is an expression of that unity, and therefore concessions in the field of orders might have grave implications both with regard to our beliefs about the Church and our participation in the life of the Church.

We are all agreed that when the question of intercommunion with any Church is considered its doctrinal beliefs must be considered as well as its system of orders. This does not mean that we hold the view that intercommunion is only possible where there is identity of belief or at least no area of positive disagreement, but that at some stage the disagreement might be so great that intercommunion would cease to be a proper expression even of an intention towards unity let alone of a unity itself. It would, for instance, be difficult for there to be inter-communion between our Church and one that held a wholly different conception of the nature of the Church itself. We have said that we believe that there can be no proper understanding of the Eucharist unless it is seen in

a wider context as part of the life of the Church. Therefore a radical disagreement as to the nature of the Eucharist might prevent inter-communion.

We hope these comments will suggest fruitful lines of thought for the World Council of Churches. Inevitably our Report appears critical in part. Where there is whole-hearted consent no comment is necessary. The pointing out of possible defects of emphasis appears to us to be the most profitable assistance that we can give. We wish to end by re-affirming that we consider the Report to be of great value and one that should be welcomed by the Church of England.

¹ This memorandum was attached as an Appendix to the Report as sent to the World Council of Churches. It contains the following passage:

"What I would plead for, on the theological grounds so admirably stated in the Section Report, is a greater flexibility (such as is also now being envisaged for liturgical experiment), which will permit different points of the front to go forward at their own (or, may we say, at God's) pace, without everything being held up until an integration of the Ministry is finally achieved. And the way in which I would visualize this happening is not by further extension to the Convocation Resolutions of January 1933 (that is, by more 'open' Anglican celebrations, which are theologically and pastorally unsatisfactory), but by concelebration. This recognizes quite openly that until integration we still require a plurality of ministries to break together the one Loaf which, for all our disunity, has yet the power to make us one Body."

CORRESPONDENCE THE SECTS

SIR,—In my article "The Sects: a Missionary Problem" in No. 323 of the *Church Quarterly Review* I expressed the hope that somebody would undertake a comprehensive survey of the Sects, their number, date and place of origin, and their methods. Canon E. M. Hughes of Jamaica, a part of the world much disturbed by the activity of the sects, draws my attention to *A Handbook of Denominations in the United States* by Frank S. Mead, published by the Abingdon Press, New York, at \$2.95. I have not myself had an opportunity of reading this book, but from what Dr Hughes tells me of it, it appears to have done all that I hoped so far as the United States is concerned.

ERIC G. JAY

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.

REVIEWS

PATRISTICS

EARLY LATIN THEOLOGY: Selections from Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Jerome. Translated and edited by S. L. GREENSLADE. (Library of Christian Classics, Vol. 5.) S.C.M. Press. 30s.

IN VOLUMES similar to this we have occasionally wished the English had been of better quality and the scholarship more exact. Here we have no reserves. The translations, as far as we have checked them, give the sense of the Latin, even if it is true that no translation can ever attain to the dignity of that noblest of languages. Incidentally, it is good to find that someone besides oneself has seen that *insulae* in a certain much-quoted sentence of Tertullian (*Apology* 37) means "tenements": Souter and Becker mistakenly have "islands", "Inseln". A short note on *principalitas* (p. 52) draws attention to the correct meaning of this, in some contexts, key word.

The title of the book should not be assumed to promise more than is provided. The works here translated are chiefly of that branch of theology which is concerned with the Church and its disciplines. Tertullian's *De Praescriptionibus Haereticorum* lays claim to the Church's sole prerogative in doctrine and the interpretation of the Scriptures, controverting all heresies whatsoever not by the scriptural and rational arguments which Tertullian will use with great effect elsewhere, but solely on the ground of their recent emergence. This work is translated in full, and to it Dr Greenslade adds the sections of the work of St Irenaeus and of Tertullian *De Pudicitia* which bear on it, and to the former of which it is indebted. The tract *De Idololatria* is an attempt, which could hardly hope to succeed, to withdraw Christians not indeed from actual idolatry but from the common life of their time, in which idolatry was at all points a corrupting factor. The strength of Tertullian's language would seem to indicate that at least some Christians were inclined to attempt a compromise. His protest was no doubt salutary: its complete success would have withdrawn the Church from its mission-field.

A treatise and three letters of St Cyprian deal with subjects of contemporary urgency but of more than contemporary importance. *De Unitate Ecclesiae Catholicae* is a condemnation of the Novatianist schism, which began in Rome but apparently had ramifications at Carthage. Its style is remonstrative rather than argumentative, and it does not seem to have had much effect in ending the schism. Its words have often been quoted, or misquoted, for or against the later claims of

the Roman See, with which indeed they have little to do, for the schism in question was not between Rome and the rest of the Church, but between two bishops in Rome itself, only one of whom could Cyprian recognize. The short letter 33 is a remonstrance against the presumption of confessors who arrogated to themselves the episcopal function of absolution after apostasy. Letters 69 and 73, on the baptismal controversy, argue that baptism by heretics is of no value, and that persons purporting to have been baptized by them, on coming over to the Church, are not "re-baptized" but "baptized". Here Cyprian, like the Pope who took the opposite view, apparently had in mind the Novatianists, who were orthodox if schismatic: but he argues his case as if they had been Marcionites or Valentinians, thus begging the question. Dr Greenslade has, on pages 120 and 123, a most valuable note on Cyprian's conception of the Church, and its theological and practical implications.

Ten letters of St Ambrose deal with various aspects of the relationships of Church and State. We move into a new world, in which Christianity is no longer proscribed and persecuted, or at best tolerated, but powerful enough, through its bishops, to make claims against the State which the emperors have perforce to grant. The enemy is now quite as much the almost-defeated Arian heretic as the heathen and the Jew: the State is the friend which, sometimes against its own better judgement, is constrained to confirm its victory over all three. Of the greatness of St Ambrose there can be no question: whether he was always right is another matter. In the controversy concerning the basilicas which the empress-mother wished to claim for the Arians, the bishop could not have acted otherwise than he did: the difference between Arian and Christian is too great for any kind of compromise. Again Ambrose was right, as was Martin, in his protest against the execution of a heretic: and his action in consequence of the massacre at Thessalonica, courageous in the Bishop, though perhaps more than necessarily humiliating for the Emperor, laid down once for all the principle that a Christian ruler is responsible in private conscience for the rectitude of his public acts. In the matter of the synagogue at Callinicum we may have our doubts: there were arguments to be considered on both sides, as there were also in the affair of the Altar of Victory: but that Ambrose should have interfered at all in matters so far outside his own episcopal jurisdiction, is a sign of the strength he knew himself to possess. The letters printed here, along with Dr Greenslade's introductory observations, set all these episodes in a clear light.

The picture of fourth-century Christianity would unfortunately not be complete without these six letters of St Jerome, or something like them. Like some of the works of Tertullian, they may cause us to wonder that Christianity was not killed by some of its most vigorous and competent exponents. Jerome's comments on 1 Kings 1. 1-4 (page 316) are an excellent illustration of how far from the point a learned man can stray: and though the letter (52) in which this occurs contains much

good advice to clerics, it has also much that one regrets that it should have been necessary to write. In reading letter 107 one can feel nothing but pity for that unfortunate little girl the younger Paula, except perhaps indignation that one who knew so little about babies should have presumed to give her mother any advice at all, and especially such advice as this. Letter 108, in praise of the elder Paula, contains, among things one would gladly pass over, a description of the pilgrimage to the Holy Places which is of permanent historical interest. Letter 146 is the famous one in which Jerome, contrary to much other evidence which he does not quote, equates the offices of bishop and presbyter. But it is well to remember that St Jerome was a far greater man than these letters by themselves would indicate.

Not enough has been said of Dr Greenslade's personal contributions to this volume. Like his translations they are beyond praise, consisting of brilliantly concise accounts of each of the four authors, as well as explanatory notes to the text, and an introduction to each work or letter which sets it in its theological or historical context. This is a model of what such a work should be, and a very fine example of English scholarship.

E. EVANS

BASIL AND APOLLINARIS

ST BASIL THE GREAT AND APOLLINARIS OF LAODICEA. By G. L. PRESTIGE.
S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

THIS book has been edited from the late Dr Prestige's papers by the Reverend Henry Chadwick of Queens' College, Cambridge. Dr Prestige's aim is to show that four letters, numbered 361 to 364, in the corpus of St Basil's correspondence, purporting to be an exchange between Basil and Apollinaris and usually regarded as spurious, are genuine. He begins with a sketch of Basil's career, and especially of the years within which the letters, if genuine, were written, the period from the renewal of Arian activity with the Synod at Sirmium, 357, to Basil's second entry into ecclesiastical politics shortly after the death of the Arian emperor Constantius, 361. He then examines the letters, arguing that they contain clear references to the events of the time. The mention in Ep. 361 of the "anxiety" occasioned by "authors of universal confusion" who have rejected the term "ousia", and the request for guidance about the admissibility of the term "homoousion" suggest that it was written by Basil in the autumn of 359 when he was attending Basil of Ancyra at the Council of Seleucia. The suggestion that the "brethren" to whom greetings are sent are monks, and that this indicates that writer and recipient had a mutual concern in monasticism, while not strong in itself, is strengthened by the remark in the next sentence that Gregory Nazianzus

had "chosen to live with his parents". Ep. 362, the ostensible reply, expounds the doctrine of Identity of Substance in keeping with the known views of Apollinaris. The reference in Ep. 363 to the writer's "travail and longing for further help" Prestige refers to Basil's intention, formed early in 362, of writing against Eunomius. The reply to this, Ep. 364, has a fairly clear reference to Basil's retirement from Caesarea to Pontus in the latter part of 362. Prestige argues also that Apollinaris wrote after receiving a copy of the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, circulated after the Synod of Alexandria, 362. But Chadwick does not agree in identifying the letter brought "by bishops coming from Egypt" with the *Tomus*. Prestige concludes his case by adducing similarities between Epp. 361 and 363 and Basil's undoubted writings, and by showing reason to suppose that Basil had Ep. 362 in mind when he wrote against Eunomius.

Mr Chadwick describes the work as "a notable advance in the study of a crucial period in the Arian controversy". As such it will engage the attention of historians and patristic scholars. But the book calls for a wider range of readers, for it provides an excellent introduction to the science of literary criticism, and indeed would interest any who enjoy the exercise of deduction, provided they have a little Greek. The subject matter of the correspondence, also, introduces the reader directly to the heart of the Trinitarian problem, and Prestige's notes on his translation of Ep. 362 and of the Eustathian document are lucid and helpful. The latter document, circulated in 375 by Eustathius of Sebasteia in order to damage Basil, Prestige takes to be by Apollinaris, possibly being a letter to Basil, drafted but never sent, on receipt of Basil's treatise against Eunomius. The Greek text of the Eustathian document is given. That of the four letters is not included. The edition of Henri de Riedmatten, O.P., is, however, shortly to be published in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. It may be hoped that theological schools will then consider including these letters among prescribed texts.

In editing Dr Prestige's papers, although disagreeing in certain points, Mr Chadwick has not altered the text. Friends of Dr Prestige will be grateful that a number of notable Prestigian touches thus survive, amongst which may be mentioned the description of Maximus the philosopher as "a rather odd creature" (p. 5), the reference to "Paulinus and his 'Wee Free' congregation" at Antioch (p. 15), and his judgement of Basil as "an adept in the defensive tactic of covering his wicket with his pads" (pp. 27-8).

ERIC G. JAY

THE MIDDLE AGES

A HISTORY OF EARLY MEDIEVAL EUROPE, 467 TO 911. By MARGARET DEANESLY. Methuen. 30s.

THE completion of what has become during a long course of years the well-known series of volumes known as "Methuen's History of Medieval

and Modern Europe" is an event "worthy of note". Nor is it perhaps altogether surprising that the one of the eight volumes which covers the earliest period in point of time should be the last to appear. When the second instalment—Dr Zachary Brooke's notable volume on the course of history "from 911 to 1198"—was published in 1938 the present work was stated to be "in preparation" by Professor J. H. Baxter of St Andrews; and Professor Margaret Deanesly, the actual author, deserves sympathy and congratulation on the achievement of a task of extraordinary difficulty and complexity. Dr Brooke stated that "only the internal history of the British Isles is omitted from the scheme of the series" and comprised the story of 287 years in 525 pages. Professor Deanesly tells us that "as is customary in this series, the history of Britain is omitted, except for casual references in allusion or for comparison" and manages to survey 435 years in 578 pages without allowing herself to be hampered unduly by so absurd a restriction, since what may well be for many readers among the most interesting and stimulating pages in the book are concerned with archaeological and artistic discoveries and details gleaned from British sources, as was only to be expected.

The area of movements and events to be covered in the twenty-nine chapters is vast, as it not only extends from the Roman Heritage in 476 and the Barbarian Movements and settlements to the end of the Carolingian Empire, but has to include Ostrogoths in Italy, Franks, Vandals, Visigoths, and economic change, Lombards in Italy, Celts and Scandinavians and Slavs and studies of the history of the Eastern Empire, the origins and conquests of Islam, Merovingians and Carolingians, the rise of a Western Empire and a Renaissance the results of which were to persist even when the balance and focus of power were changed as well as shifted. Whether or not the result is a philosophy of history may be doubted, but Professor Deanesly with all her width of reading and wealth of erudition is a sprightly writer and cheerfulness is "always breaking in" even from the preface where she assures us that "it was the nomads settled in the Crimea who taught us to use safety-pins, and the Syrian merchants to eat black [French] plums at Christmas". It is really astonishing to find how much she has managed to include, and although some sections may seem in consequence to be a little overweighted with detail there are chapters where, as in regard to Islam, she attempts a wider sweep and occasional excursions into literary and archaeological bypaths in which those who accompany her will congratulate themselves on the pleasure and enjoyment which they have received. They will be conscious of having been shown lines of thinking for themselves which may well be worth following up. It is true that despite Tertullian "Romanitas" may pall a little after the fifteenth reference and "climate of opinion" seem less attractive as a cliché than it did when first suggested. We may be sure that Constans II cannot have concluded a truce in 680 and that the account of the giving of the "first tonsure" and its consequences needs to be rewritten in important particulars. There are expansions like those of *De Vir Ill.* and *M.G.H.* and misprints

on pp. 38, 47 (cf. 410), 51, 78, 112, 113, 146, 163, 264, 266, 382, 385, 401, of the type which used to stir the phlegm of Professor A. E. Housman; but these are specks on a wide surface generally clean, and though the purist may grumble at forms like "Seleukia-Ctesiphon", which are neither one thing nor the other, and wish that the student who is being introduced to the "*eigenkirche*" had been told what it meant, he will do better to be thankful for what he receives. We need not grumble if readers are given, as often in this volume, the results of research which is in advance of what they will find in many other volumes; it cannot be said that the bibliographical notes at the end of some of the chapters supply the want of the footnotes which the plan of the series for the most part excludes. The average English rector of an ancient parish may or may not envisage himself as the more or less direct lineal descendant of a pagan priest with the obligation of supplying the bull and the boar for the service of the interests of his little community—an obligation of which traces survive as late as leaser in the days of the Commonwealth—but he might be given a reference to Dr E. W. Watson's little volume on the Church of England in the Home University Library or to Liebermann's *Gesetze* from which the original suggestion is taken. On the other hand it is only fair to recognize that the learned author does vouchsafe a footnote reference to Père Mandonnet's *Saint Dominique* (1937) in justification for the statement that "the history of the rule" of St Augustine "has recently been made clear", and if we wish that she had done the same for later statements that "the influence of Arab practice and Persian art on the iconoclasts is now accepted" and that "the iconoclast movement had been a spiritual invasion from the east", the doubter in either case can take refuge in the apophthegm of the *Sic et Non*: "By doubting we are led to inquire; by inquiry we arrive at the truth". Nor whatever view he adopts will he fail to be grateful to Professor Deanesly for her valuable and interesting work.

CLAUDE JENKINS

THE JEWISH MESSIAH

THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN ISRAEL. By JOSEPH KLAUSNER. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

DR KLAUSNER'S book is the third part of a trilogy, which is well-known by its Jewish appraisal of *Jesus of Nazareth* and the developments *From Jesus to Paul*. The work under review again falls into three divisions, Biblical, inter-testamental, and Tannaitic. It was, however, not written in that order. The last part was written in German as a dissertation at Heidelberg, in 1902, the Biblical part appeared first in 1909 in Cracow, and the second part was written and printed in Jerusalem in 1921. These dates and names of places reveal the broad canvas both of the author's life and of his love for the Messianic Idea. The

present edition received its last revision in 1949 and owes its appearance in English to a sensitive translation by Professor W. F. Stinespring.

Let it be said at once that Dr Klausner's greatest merit as well as original purpose lies no doubt in bringing to the notice of his fellow-citizens in Israel the majestic tradition of Messianism and, incidentally, the ever-present challenge of the Christian interpretation which he, of course, does not accept but firmly repudiates. Nevertheless, a voice like his, crying in the wilderness of a very this-worldly, almost anti-Messianic, Israel, must evoke a response. Therefore this volume cannot fail to stimulate the Jewish readers to the same extent as the other parts of the trilogy.

For the Christian reader, however, the situation is somewhat different. If he is soaked in the Scriptures, and in the New Testament in particular, he needs no fresh springs of Messianic enthusiasm. For him the greatest help rendered by Dr Klausner's work will no doubt lie in the direct approach to the subject. He will appreciate the political realism, for instance, which piety can so easily obscure.

Dr Klausner has taken new opinions and new works on Messianism (until 1948) into account as far as it was in his power. The history of the work will easily explain why there are of necessity wide *lacunae* which indicate that he could not always obtain access to such work as was being done elsewhere, especially in Scandinavia and in the English-speaking part of the world. It is odd nowadays to read a book about the Messiah without reference to the followers and descendants of Frazer's school, to hear nothing of the sacred King and related myth-ritual patterns, etc. The comparative data do not figure here. It is very unlikely that Dr Klausner shut his eyes to the challenge of Babylon, Ugarit, and perhaps even Qumran. More probably he decided that his study was meant to be confined to Hebrew sources and that he did not wish to dilute them with alien material.

This limitation of material makes the book easy reading, but the student ought to be warned that for the same reason too many relevant data are omitted to make it in any way a text-book for an examination. The Biblical part in particular suffers from a certain over-simplification and at times never gets beyond a deeply-felt summary of the individual books. The treatment of the Psalms is totally inadequate, and forces the reader to consult Gunkel, Mowinckel, and Johnson. Yet there is something very endearing in the old-fashioned method of a great scholar. His emphasis on feeling seems particularly appropriate at a time when wholly alien, rationalistic tools of analysis are used to misunderstand the Bible. Contradictoriness is to Dr Klausner no problem; thus the Messianic idea continually oscillates between the directly political and this-worldly on the one hand, and the spiritual and supernatural on the other. Eschatology is largely the result of hope deferred.

Part II deals with the Messianic idea in the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. It is too sketchy to be of great value and can do little more than steer the novice's ship in the deep waters of that literature. Charles's work is immeasurably more authoritative. Obviously

this part of Dr Klausner's work was written entirely for the benefit of Jews wholly unacquainted with this somewhat unpopular period of apocalyptic thought.

Thus it is Part III, the original dissertation, which makes the most rewarding reading. The Christian must not be too shocked by the claim that he can see from the Tannaitic Messianic views "what there is in 'Christology' that comes from Judaism; and so what there is in it of the original views of Jesus and the earliest Christians, and what there is of pagan ideas adopted by Paul and his successors . . ." (p. 389). Surely it is not quite so simple, for the Rabbis could not help reacting against the phenomenon of Christianity throughout their work. Dr Klausner is, of course, under the influence of outstanding German modernists of an age now almost forgotten, and he cannot be expected to come to terms with something like W. D. Davies' *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, although the short comparative study "The Jewish and the Christian Messiah", included as an appendix, is fair and helpful.

The main thesis—"the kingdom of the Jewish King-Messiah was and remained . . . a kingdom of this world"—will always remain worth pondering, for it is a thesis which underlines not only the problem of Judaism as opposed to Christianity but the whole enigma of the relationship between the power of God and the power of man. It is a thesis which, for better or worse, gained a strong foothold in Church government and in the Christian tradition and retains a practical rather than academic interest.

U. E. SIMON

SYNOPTIC STUDIES

JESUS AND THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS. By WALTER E. BUNDY. Harvard University Press. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege. 6os.

IF PAINSTAKING scholarship were enough to secure the success of a book, then this "introduction to the synoptic tradition" should be successful indeed. It is certainly exhaustive. Its claim to give "a critical study of every story, saying, bit of dialogue, and even incidental notice, in the various forms and versions in which each appears in Matthew, Mark, and Luke" is justified by the contents. Actually it does more than it promises, for it gives carefully prepared parallel tables showing the structure and composition of the synoptic tradition, as well as illustrating the theory of a proto-Luke and an urMark. In the text every passage is dealt with from the point of view of its literary history and every opinion of importance seems to be recorded. As a result it is sometimes a little difficult to find out what the author himself thinks about a particular passage although his general position is clear enough.

It is in this connection that one feels something more than painstaking scholarship is necessary to make a book a success. It requires also a capacity for sound judgement in the author which will give confidence in his handling of his material. Particularly is this so in the case of a book like the present which offers no scope for continuous reading or for any literary graces. Here it is precisely the author's judgement which will seem to many to be at fault. The frequency with which he quotes Loisy with apparent approval suggests a warning. We then find that where we can be sure of the author's own decision it has been often reached on too light-hearted and paradoxical a basis. Thus the resurrection stories did not arise as an enlargement upon the empty tomb but the empty tomb was invented to explain the resurrection stories. The two stories about our Lord's childhood in Luke 2. 21-52, although they are clearly Jewish, "might be regarded as expansions of the primitive vague tradition, 'born of a woman, born under the law' ". The story of Martha and Mary is a piece of Christian invention, "... pure legend featuring the piety of saintly persons". On the other hand, of St Luke's record of the disciples' request to be taught how to pray, the author allows that "this editorial contribution of Luke may contain some historical tradition". Similarly in the Lucan account of the Last Supper you get genuine history in the first half (22. 15-18) "where there is not the faintest suggestion that Jesus is instituting a new religious rite or sacrament", while in the second half (19-20) you get "pure Christian cult", though there is not the slightest attempt to show where the Christian cult came from if not from the Last Supper.

In a final couple of paragraphs the author explains that the synoptic account is neither history nor biography but tradition, and complains that that tradition presents a Christ who is now one person and now another and that there is no clear or consistent portrayal of Jesus in the first three gospels. "In all the welter of conception and depiction in this tradition the historical traits will be those which are genuinely human, typically Jewish, and exclusively religious." One can only ask, Why?

W.W.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

ST JOHN'S GOSPEL: A Commentary. By R. H. LIGHTFOOT, edited by C. F. EVANS. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30s.

EVERYONE will be happy to know that R. H. Lightfoot left behind sufficient material to be fashioned into this book, and everyone will be ready to congratulate C. F. Evans on having done the editing so well that it is impossible to tell where the author ends and the editor begins. To form a just estimate of the resultant volume it is necessary to remember that the manuscript was originally intended to serve as one of the Clarendon Bible commentaries and that it was published in this separate form only because it turned out to be too bulky for its first

purpose. It should not therefore be compared with the great works based on the Greek text. It does not strike out lines of original research like Dodd's introduction nor range over the authorities like Bernard's two volumes. There are practically no footnotes and almost the only authority quoted is Bernard himself. For the most part it is content to let the fourth gospel explain itself by itself. Consequently what we get is almost undiluted Lightfoot, saint, scholar, and mystic. What more sympathetic dealing with a document of this kind could we possibly expect or demand?

There is indeed constant comparison with the synoptics, and the difference between them is shown to be not nearly so great as used to be thought. If in the first three gospels we get history grounded in theology, in the fourth we get theology grounded in history; but there is history and theology in all four, and Lightfoot insists as strongly as anyone could on the importance of history in St John. Consequently the fourth gospel is really complementary to the other three, and without it the three could not properly be understood. Lightfoot is surprisingly tender to the tradition of apostolic authorship. Without venturing upon a definite answer to the vexed question, he insists that the gospel was in circulation before the end of the first century and that that fact puts apostolic authorship well within the bounds of possibility. In view of what Barrett and some other recent commentators have said is it likely that the steadiness of English scholarship is about to be rewarded, and that the learned world will refuse to be stampeded any longer into putting late dates on New Testament documents without sufficient evidence?

In other respects also Lightfoot takes what would generally be regarded as a somewhat conservative view. He is not happy about attempts to cut up the document, although he agrees that some slight rearrangement would make the narrative run more smoothly. He is surely right in contending that the prologue is no mere afterthought but is intended to set the tone for the whole of the gospel. The final chapter he takes as an appendix but appears to think it was added by the original author in order to set the relations between St Peter and the beloved disciple in the right perspective. The latter's "concern, as the disciple of chief spiritual insight, was not, like that of St Peter, to have the oversight of the practical life of the Church; he was to remain, throughout his life, the witness and guardian of the Lord's revelation and of the truth of the Gospel".

Perhaps the most valuable feature of the commentary is the care with which it brings out the symbolic element in the thought of St John. Nowhere is this more conspicuous than in the pages devoted to the raising of Lazarus. On the devotional side its strength lies in its development of the theme of mystical union or, as Lightfoot calls it, the "mutual indwelling" of Christ and the believer, a doctrine to which the sacramental teaching brings strong reinforcement. Altogether a most welcome addition to the recent literature on St John.

W.W.

THE EXISTENTIALIST CHRIST

CHRISTOLOGY AND MYTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GERAINT VAUGHAN JONES. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

MUCH of contemporary theology resembles the wares which arrive from foreign ports and have to be unloaded in and distributed from the docks. British theologians are at present great importers, and their balance of payment is in peril. Who, for instance, in Germany knows half as much of English theology—or has the opportunity of knowing as much—as we in England know of Bultmann's work? Mr Jones evidently thinks that we do not know enough, and he has spared no pains to take his readers right into the welter of “de-mythed”, existentialist theology. If anyone wishes to be acquainted with the many voices, both for and against myth, let him not miss this opportunity.

One point, however, should be born in mind in connection with the whole tide of Bultmannism; it has somehow changed its nature in transit. Perhaps this is not necessarily a bad thing, for many religious movements have undergone useful mutations in their migrations. The exchange of ideas often leads to unpredictable results. Nevertheless, in the case of Bultmann, it should surely be remembered that the transhipment has taken a very long time, twenty years or more. I wish Mr Jones had rounded off his detailed study with a short political sketch to give the appropriate *Sitz im Leben* to Bultmann himself. Form-criticism can work with a vengeance: Marburg in the twenties and thirties, the whole extraordinary situation in Germany then, must be recalled to account for some of the equally extraordinary axioms of the school of Heidegger. Even the jargon (e.g. “geschichtlich”, *historisch*”, etc.) comes straight from the disastrous politics of the period, when, incidentally, English theologians were also struggling with the relevance of Christianity to the world, though in so different a way. Can any reader take Bultmann's “Jesus” really seriously without hearing, so to speak, the threatening “*Horst Wessel Lied*” in the background? The historical Son of God, born of a Jewish lady, Saviour of the whole world, had become totally unacceptable at the time, and that despite the work of men like Schlatter, Strack, Billerbeck, Dalman. I remember only too well the swastika, imposed on the Cross, in slogans, on posters, even in school class-rooms while religious instruction was being given. I am not charging Bultmann with such excesses, but I do not believe that his work should be read apart from a realization that these and later events, such as the war in Russia, were happening at the same time. Objectivity is out of place in existentialism. Bultmann's theological decision is also a personal, political fact; it provides the master-key to the maze of myth and eschatology.

Mr Jones wisely refrains from traversing the whole field of problems and devotes his scholarship only to that of Christology. He mediates the radicalism of Bousset and Bultmann, and shows how their problems, well-known in other quarters, received not only different answers but also met with different methodologies. The reader stands outside the

arena and can watch the protagonists, fired by the never-failing *odium theologicum*, struggling for definitions, attitudes, reconstructions. The author gives us a surfeit of partisans, and one sometimes longs for Bultmann's own procedure, which largely dispenses with footnotes and distractions. At times one cannot help losing the trend of the controversy and is inclined to dismiss the whole thing as the last battle between the theological equivalents of Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Whence comes this sense of unreality? Assuredly, it is not the author's fault that he takes us around a Wonderland which is as confusing as it is unenjoyable. The confusion derives from the existentialists' own dilemma: "The propositions contained in the Apostles' Creed are not based upon facts; they are, what most of us would call, untrue. Moreover, they are mythological and therefore meaningless to contemporary man." Now it would be reasonable to assume that what is both untrue and inaccessible might be jettisoned without loss. But no! This Jesus—not Lord incarnate, unknown and unknowable from the records, not risen, nor ascended—must meet *me* in the Preaching. Why this is so is never explained, nor can it be explained. The world has given its own comment in preferring quite naturally such ideologies which are not burdened with this ancient ballast and acknowledge only one true, existentialist, criterion, namely that of indisputable power upon earth.

Mr Jones, however, if I understand him properly, approaches this confusion with his own conviction that some data of traditional Christology are not untrue though they are couched in a mythical terminology. He does not simply underwrite the radicalism of what used to be called heresy, nor does he come out on the side of Catholic orthodoxy or reformed (Barthian) theology. He is evidently none too happy within the narrow confines of existentialism, for he can write: "The conception of the Cosmic Christ, however, is more than mythological, just as its significance is wider than its 'existential' implication." But immediately the existentialist qualification re-enters: "The ultimate significance of the place of Christ in creation is necessary to my self-understanding and appreciation of it is prior to it. What matters is not the truth or otherwise of the affirmation of the creative function of Jesus Christ, the *Kyrios*, but the fact that in him the Creator God is revealed and made intelligible and makes our destiny intelligible" (p. 177). But is it not precisely that truth and objectivity—or falsehood and subjectivity—are really prior to everything else? Is God still God, in an ontological, absolute sense, apart from human destiny and decision?

This book, like so many of its kind, becomes the repository of many incompatible views. Even well over a century ago Goethe scorned theologians and their endless squabbles about points for which no evidence could be obtained. He confessed himself tired of their "Jesus", not without adding that he would be interested if he could meet him and obtain direct information. A reading of this book provokes a similar impatience and a yearning for direct, empirical evidence, possibly that of the New Testament itself.

U. E. SIMON

GRACE IN THE BIBLE

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF GRACE. By C. RYDER SMITH. Epworth Press.
22s. 6d.

A SITUATION in which the two principal traditions of Christendom use the word *grace* to denote quite distinct aspects of God's dealings with man has long called for an independent study of its biblical usage. If Dr Ryder Smith has not altogether supplied the deficiency, the fault lies not with his scholarship but with his self-imposed limitation of scope. Aware that the implications of the Bible doctrine of grace are not exhausted by an examination of the use of *charis* and its cognates in the N.T., yet unwilling to repeat what he has already written in previous studies of the Bible doctrines of man, sin, and salvation, he is reduced to the (by his own admission) arbitrary choice of some eight further words whose O.T. antecedents and LXX and N.T. usage he also examines. The selection throws some light on the presuppositions with which he himself approaches the doctrine of grace, but it does not make for unity of approach to his subject, especially as no attempt is made at the end of the book to draw together the results of his discussion. It is also possible that readers unfamiliar with the homiletic tradition from which Dr Ryder Smith writes may be somewhat put off by the evident and sustained use of stock pulpit illustrations in a book of this kind, and may even find a few of them unintentionally comic.

The lexicography, both Hebrew and Greek, is scholarly and painstaking, and the examination of the usage of the word *agape* in the light of its LXX antecedents, in particular, provides so useful a retort to Dr Nygren that it is a pity that the author did not for once abandon his self-denying ordinance concerning the naming of other scholars. His discussion of *gnosis*, by contrast, fails for lack of reference to its implications for the Gentile world. A chapter on the doctrine of election, which argues convincingly for an Arminian interpretation of the most apparently predestinarian passages of St Paul, also succeeds in throwing real light on the regular association of *corner-stone* and *stumbling-block* throughout the N.T.

His least satisfactory chapter is his last on "The Fellowship of God with Man in Christ". The word *fellowship*, already overworked in the English versions of the Bible, has since become something of a pulpit cliché, and it is more than doubtful whether it adequately conveys to modern ears the full range of meaning of the N.T. *koinonia*, with its double connotation of sharing *in* and communion *with*, of which Fr Thornton has given us so illuminating an account in *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*. To expound this, as Dr Ryder Smith does, with reference to the individual only, in isolation from the Church, is really to attempt the impossible; nor does his claim that the phrases "in Christ" and "in the body of Christ" stand for quite distinct notions carry conviction. This restriction of range leads to an altogether disproportionate emphasis on the element of *experience*, and to a conception of baptism as a symbol which "expresses and enhances and

nourishes the experience", which, by failing to do justice to its *effective* character in the N.T., shuts the door on an aspect of the operation of the grace of God—the sacramental—to which later theology has given great prominence. Dr Ryder Smith insists that his purpose "is only to describe Apostolic doctrine, not to discuss resultant problems". Still, it is a pity to obscure by misplaced emphasis the eirenic possibilities in such a subject as this.

All Hebrew and Greek words have been transliterated for the benefit of the non-specialist, the Greek not altogether consistently. The title of one of the author's earlier books is given inaccurately on p. 62, and misprints have been noted on pp. 15, 119, and 182.

HUMPHREY GREEN

THE SCROLLS AGAIN

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ORIGINALITY OF CHRIST. By GEOFFREY GRAYSTONE, S.M. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

THIS country has been mercifully spared the intensely hysterical outburst that has in America followed the discovery of the ancient library at Qumran. Daily papers that should have known better have played up the news as if it were likely to do some permanent danger to the Christian faith and indeed make that faith no longer tenable or necessary. To all such suggestions Fr Graystone gives a quiet, sensible, and well-documented reply.

Although there is curiously no table of contents, one discovers that there are four chapters. The first deals with the story of the scrolls and their contents, giving a very readable and interesting account. The second deals with the resemblances between the Qumran writings and the New Testament. The conclusion here is that, where verbal likenesses are found, these should be referred back to the Old Testament as the common source. That is to say, the New Testament is not directly indebted to the Qumran writings, or even indirectly. The third chapter deals with the doctrine and philosophy exhibited in the writings and the same conclusion is drawn. The last chapter reviews an American work on the scrolls which is typical of the unhealthy excitement mentioned above. The conclusion of the whole matter is: "The candid reader who examines carefully the writings of the Qumran and then turns to read the New Testament, cannot fail to be impressed with the tremendous gulf that separated the two." And again: "The perusal of the scrolls side by side with the gospels and New Testament does but bring into greater relief the uniqueness of Christ and the transcendence of the religion which he founded."

An excellent book to put into the hands of any who are inclined to be troubled about the difference to our view of Christianity the discovery of the scrolls is alleged to have made.

W.W.

A RUSSIAN BIBLE

THE BIBLE IN RUSSIAN. Published by the Moscow Patriarchate.

IN PUBLISHING this edition of the Bible in the vernacular the Patriarchate of Moscow is being true to its own traditions. For a close attachment to Holy Scripture has always been one of the outstanding features of Russian Orthodoxy. Any letter from any Russian bishop to his flock will contain frequent quotations from, or allusions to, the Bible, each of them with chapter and verse duly added in brackets. Children learning their catechism and theologians writing their treatises do so in a biblical atmosphere. This is deeply rooted in Russian religion. Thanks to contact with the Bulgarians and the work of St Cyril and St Methodius, most, if not the whole, of the Bible in Slavonic had made its way into Russia almost a generation before the Christian religion was officially adopted by Vladimir.

True to the same principle, in due course the Russian missionaries in their great drive to the north and east across Siberia to Japan from the time of St Stephen of Perm in the fourteenth century onwards, regarded the translation of the Bible and the Service Books into the various languages of their converts as a first claim upon their energies.

In the eleventh and following centuries the language of the Slavonic Bible was roughly speaking the language of the people. But the spoken language was a living, growing thing, while the Church Slavonic lay fossilized in the sacred texts. As early as the middle of the fourteenth century the divergencies between the two were beginning to be noted by ecclesiastical authority; and the gap continued to widen. It was bound to become more obvious and disquieting after the first printed edition of the Slavonic Bible was issued in 1581 (there is a copy in the British Museum) and copies of the Scriptures became much more numerous. It is true that the gulf between Church Slavonic and the Russian spoken and written by educated people was very much greater than that between Church Slavonic and the language of the peasants. In a well-known essay Birkbeck maintained that the peasants could follow the Church Slavonic even in the middle of the nineteenth century. But it was in the early years of that century that the Metropolitan Philaret was urging the production of a Bible in the vernacular because "the language of the Slavonic which in its time was generally understood and used, is no longer so, and a large proportion of the Russian Orthodox people require a Russian translation to enable them to understand the Scriptures". In Philaret's own famous catechism the scriptural citations and references were given in Russian, not Slavonic.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the British and Foreign Bible Society appeared in Russia and was received with open arms. A corresponding Russian Bible Society was founded under the very highest patronage in Church and State. The Bible Societies served the Russian Church well, and under their auspices the Scriptures, in whole or in part, were printed in some forty languages. Oddly enough vernacular

Russian was not at first one of them. Not because the Russian Church did not approve of "the open Bible"; but the British and Foreign Bible Society, after all was foreign, and if some might concede that it was orthodox with a small "o" it certainly was not Orthodox. It fell under suspicion and was finally suppressed. Not until 1875 was the whole Bible printed in vernacular Russian officially and with the authority of the Holy Synod.

The present issue is then something of an occasion, looking back as it does to that date 81 years ago. It is also the first official Russian Bible to be printed in the new orthography.

It has nothing by way of preface or introduction. The title page reads: "The Bible or Books of Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments in a Russian translation with parallel passages and a table of Church Lessons". The next page states that it is issued with the blessing of Alexis, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

To judge from a comparison with a Russian Bible published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1922, which was a reprint of a special edition (without Apocrypha or the LXX variations) of the Synodal Version, there is little if any change in the text of the canonical books of both Testaments. The practice is continued of printing (as in our own A.V.) in italics words not actually found in the original but added to clarify the sense. The result might be of course to make a choice between two possible interpretations. An interesting case in point is Mark 1. 10, which in the Russian reads: "And when he came out of the water, straightway John saw . . ."

The books of the Apocrypha are included but not collected to form a separate section between the two Testaments as we are accustomed to see them. The order is that of the LXX, the influence of which has always been dominant in the various issues of the Bible in Russia. Fedotov (in *The Russian Religious Mind*) has told us that "in Russia the notion of the Biblical Canon distinguishing strongly between the inspired Holy Scripture and the works of the Fathers, never existed". And writing about the Synodal Version in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* last August, Professor Osipov says that the guiding influence of the LXX not only affects the make-up of the Bible, but extends also to the form of the titles of many books and proper names. This holds good for the present version in which we find 2 Ezdras, Tobit, and Judith between Nehemiah and Esther; the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus after Lamentations. The Song of the Three Children, Susannah, and Bel are integral parts of Daniel, and so on. Nothing distinguishes all these from the rest of the O.T. except footnotes to say that they are translated from the Greek adding in the case of the Prayer of Manasses and Maccabees that they are not in the Hebrew. The Third book of Ezdras which follows Maccabees III and closes the O.T. has a note to say that it is in neither the Hebrew nor the Greek, but that the Russian translation, as the Slavonic before it, has been made from the Vulgate.

In the N.T. the seven general epistles are placed between Acts and Romans.

The references to parallel passages are copious. It is some disadvantage, however, that there is no reference to them in the text. They are all to be found at the bottom of the page under the chapter and verse to which each refers. Thus the reader has to look to see if there is any reference attached to the verse he has just read. And if there is one, or more, he must judge for himself to what precise word or phrase the reference applies. But it must be admitted that this arrangement improves the look of the page.

It is a bulky volume and its 1,280 pages make up a thickness of $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches and a weight which the binding perhaps will not long sustain. But the type is clear and easily read and, if a foreigner may be allowed to express the opinion, the language is simple and strong.

A number of words, like "phylactery" and "proselyte", and some weights and measures, are explained in footnotes, and there are a few rather indifferent maps in black and white at the end.

R. M. FRENCH

THE ATONEMENT

RECONCILIATION IN CHRIST. By G. W. H. LAMPE. Longmans, Green and Co. 6s. 6d.

PROFESSOR LAMPE delivered the Maurice Lectures at King's College, London, in the Lent Term of 1955. As the title suggests, the Lectures, slightly expanded and reproduced in this book, examine the meaning of the Atonement with special reference to the doctrine of Justification by Faith. Dr Lampe's attention was turned to this scheme as the result of certain discussions between members of the Evangelical Fellowship of Theological Literature and a group mainly composed of members of the Community of the Resurrection. Papers read there have been already published. But it is worth noting that from this exchange Dr Lampe went back to study some aspects of the teaching of Frederick Denison Maurice. Throughout these lectures there is constant reference to Maurice's thought, and effective choice of quotation from Maurice strengthens the view that among Anglican thinkers there is none who speaks with more contemporary significance on so many themes of present importance than Maurice himself.

The book is a criticism of certain views of the Atonement which involve the idea that God accepts sinful man on the ground of the merits of Christ. It was because Maurice insisted that our interpretation of the work of Christ must be expressed in personal rather than in forensic or legalistic categories, and above all his firm grasp of the fundamental Trinitarian presuppositions which must form the basis of any satisfactory doctrine of the Atonement that Dr Lampe takes as his starting point certain passages from Maurice's works which illuminate the path he seeks to tread.

After examining carefully the New Testament interpretation of the work of Christ, Dr Lampe concludes that there is a general agreement that Christ's death is a death to sin, an obedient acceptance of man's true status of humble dependence upon God, and above all a means of reconciliation by which fellowship between God and man is restored. "In no instance is there any expression of the idea that Christ's superlative merits have earned pardon for sinful people, nor is there any indication of the later doctrine of the imputation of those merits to sinners" (p. 52).

It is in a new personal relationship to God that man is set by the reconciling work of Christ. "In Christ he is vindicated and accepted although he is a sinner." To be "in Christ" is to be in the Church, for "we are incorporated into His Body and His Body is the Church". It is the Church collectively which is in Christ. Thus Christian Unity is only to be expected as a consequence of a firmer hold upon the Church's status of being in Christ through deeper and stronger faith. Dr Lampe proceeds to make some original and stimulating comments upon the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments.

Despite its cheapness and its paper covers this book is in no sense popular. It is tightly packed with learning and thought. The clergy would find it admirable as a basis for Lent preaching, and its controversial aspects are always subordinate to positive Biblical exposition. How far Dr Lampe has fully dealt with the idea of merit may be questioned inasmuch as he gives less attention than he should to some of the sayings of our Lord upon the theme, and to certain words of St Paul (e.g. Rom. 12. 5; 1 Cor. 12. 26; Col. 1. 24) which could imply some New Testament basis for the later doctrine. Dr Lampe's book deserves the most careful study.

MARCUS KNIGHT

SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE

THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT; LIGHT OF CHRIST; ABBA. By EVELYN UNDERHILL. Longmans, Green and Co. 9s. 6d.

MESSRS. LONGMANS are doing a good service in publishing reprints of devotional classics in this form. Size, print, cover, price, and marker are good. The marker is an indication of the character of the book, to be read slowly and digested a few pages at a time; to encourage and guide daily meditation over a period.

Evelyn Underhill had already published two books when her important work, *Mysticism*, appeared in 1911 and went into four editions within eighteen months. Her second large work, *The Mystic Way*, appeared in 1913. These take their place in a great revival of interest in Europe and America in the field of religious experience, in

which Dean Inge was something of a pioneer in his Bampton Lectures of 1899—and Baron von Hûgel an outstanding figure.

The breadth of her scholarship and depth of her understanding were apparent in these books. But the material now reprinted gives us a different Evelyn Underhill, in whom scholarship is incidental, a mature spiritual teacher and evangelistic force. The quality of her writing suggests that this will not be the last edition of this part of her life's work.

The volume contains two series of Retreat Addresses given at Pleshey in 1932 and 1936. That which she prepared so carefully for reading in a special atmosphere to a comparatively small group of educated women is entirely suitable, even in its telling illustrations, to men. In fact she has in some ways rather a masculine mind. What is required to appreciate them is a measure of education and a determination to give such reading time; or the exceptional quality of her perception would be missed.

The last section contains a series of meditations on the Lord's Prayer in which are to be found some of the most impressive paragraphs in the volume.

No one could read these addresses without feeling that he knew the author; but such intimacy is enriched by a brief memoir, and also eight quarterly letters which she wrote in the last two years of her life for circulation to a group of young women then studying theology. These illustrate one more side of her life, that of a most understanding pastor to individuals.

From the storehouse of her mind steeped in the classical masters of the devotional life she could bring forth treasures to meet or illustrate any problem of experience. By so doing she introduces her readers again and again to those great pastors of souls whose writings are never out of date.

The pressure of the divine spirit upon the soul, the costly claims it makes, the absolute priority of the Will of the Father, the glory of God are the dominating thoughts from cover to cover: as they were to her the living realities. Most impressive is her exposition of the difficult clause in the Lord's Prayer—"Lead us not into temptation". She brilliantly handles "the journey of the soul through life" giving it new significance by comparison with the experiences of Alice through the looking glass. Then, apologizing for using "so childish an allegory as the veil of so great a mystery", she passes naturally in the course of ten pages to J. N. Grou, de Caussade, Kierkegaard, de Tourville, Thomas à Kempis, St Paul, and the Psalms in a way that is both masterly and original.

JOHN BREWIS

PURITAN DISCIPLINE

DELINQUENT SAINTS: A study of the discipline of the early Congregational Churches in Massachusetts. By EMIL OBERHOLZER, Jr. Columbia University Press. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege. 48s.

IT IS significant that this book is put forth as part of the Columbia Studies in the Social Sciences. Whereas most writers on such a theme as this would be chiefly concerned with some theological issue, Dr Oberholzer is "distinctly sceptical of the methods of some theologians who attempt to exploit the name of Clio for the sake of 'theological history'", and he has, therefore, quite self-consciously written an essay in sociology. This, of course, he is entirely entitled to do; but it may very well be that the result of his researches will be more interesting to the theologian and to the church historian than to the student of political science: from the sociological point of view the issue at stake and the area of research is relatively insignificant, whereas the religious and ecclesiastical issues are profound and perennial; indeed, they are made the more painfully searching simply by being portrayed on so narrow a canvas.

Let it be said at once that this is a quite remarkable piece of research. The evidence upon which the author draws is indicated in a list of references which extends from p. 263 to p. 335; and this is followed (pp. 337-71) by a detailed note on bibliography. The volume, therefore, has some considerable worth as a guide for those who wish to know what sources of information there may be about early Congregationalism in Massachusetts and where they are located. There is also a number of statistical tables which purport to show the relation between types of sin, periods of history, and the sex of the offenders: e.g., Table IV is headed, "Cases of Fornication, by County, Period, and Offender's Sex", and these are related to the periods into which Dr Oberholzer has divided his research. One is tempted to inquire what value such statistics can have. It is indeed germane to Dr Oberholzer's argument that these offences in Table IV were ten times more frequent in 1730-69 than in 1620-89; but what is to be deduced from this is not clear unless we also know how many more Congregationalists there were in the latter period than in the former: about this the tables are silent. In any case, it would have been a great improvement if the author had arranged his material more chronologically and not relied upon these tables to make clear these comparisons, which, if significant at all, should have been expounded more clearly in the text itself.

The main part of the book opens with a discussion in the first two chapters of the fundamental idea upon which Congregationalists base their understanding of church membership, the covenant-relationship: "by 'owning the covenant', the Puritan became a full-fledged church member, and all the disciplinary action of the church was based on the covenant relationship" (p. 15). In these two chapters Dr Oberholzer describes what owning the covenant was taken to mean and what was

regarded as constituting a breach of it. It is shown that to fall short of certain more or less explicitly understood moral standards was taken as an indication that the member had made a hypocritical confession of faith or else had fallen from grace since owning the covenant. The sins which were deemed to fall within this category were either of omission or commission; and in the next two chapters the author goes into a detailed account of these two types of sin as understood by the people whose churchly habits he has under discussion. The succeeding chapters work out in detail what treatment was accorded to such sinners as were found within these Puritan fellowships; and then the author rounds off his study by discussing more generally "The Churches as Courts of Law", "The Churches and the State", "The Enjoyment of Worldly Pleasure"; and in a less satisfactory chapter, "The Unattained Utopia". He comes as near as he ever does to a general judgement on the mass of material which his astonishing industry has collected.

Throughout Dr Oberholzer's treatment of the evidence he makes the attempt to compare the need for discipline in various counties of Massachusetts and to show how certain religious awakenings affected Christian behaviour. It is, as we have seen, an open question whether the former can be a useful enterprise; and the latter has not really been brought out clearly enough: here and there a part of the picture emerges, never the whole.

The main value of this book is that by its detailed and lengthy quotation from the sources it enables the reader to see not only what offences were dealt with and what corrective measures employed but also to sample the very atmosphere of those intense fellowships in which mutual care was taken with such terrifying seriousness.

There is abundant material here for those who take pleasure in giving longer life to the vulgar lie that Puritanism is a religion for relentless kill-joys. Valid criticisms can indeed be made about excesses of zeal and failure to take due account of inward sins. The final chapter reveals that Dr Oberholzer is not fundamentally in sympathy with those Puritan attempts at godly discipline; but he does not attempt to deal, for it lies outside the self-imposed boundaries within which he has worked, with the issues which his book will leave with all pastors and theologians who read it: How are purity of Christian life and witness to be maintained? Are the sins which Christians commit to be treated as if they are of little or no consequence? While it is true indeed that outward sins are less important than such inward sins as pride and evil imagination, does that really mean that we ought to take outward sins as a matter of course? We must, of course, agree with the implication of Dr Oberholzer's work that the Puritan attempt to set up pure churches, an attempt much more akin in its motives to monasticism than is often allowed, met with failure largely because it did not avoid the sins of the Pharisees; but it is an open question whether our easy tolerance of sin is not even less Christian than the Puritan's holy intolerance.

JOHN HUXTABLE

SPIRITUAL REFORM

THE FAITH AND MODERN ERROR. By HARRY BLAMIRES. S.P.C.K. 15s.

THE Church's greatest danger is that of being untrue to itself. By this is meant a weakening of its supernatural function and quality until at length it is reduced to the level of any natural institution. The utterance of this solemn warning is the purpose of Mr Blamires' book, *The Faith and Modern Error*. His is no hysterical cry of fear but a sober analysis of the present situation; and from his analysis the author maps out the road of renewal along which, in his estimation, the Church must travel.

The danger is seen to be three-fold. First, the Church has been infected by the spirit of the age. This is a secular spirit satisfied with the material, and self-sufficient to the exclusion of the divine. Local churches find a pre-occupation with the supernatural hard to sustain, with the result that they concentrate more and more on a programme of popular humanism and less and less on a pattern of essential other-worldliness.

Secondly, in an attempt—laudable in itself—to interpret the Gospel to the twentieth-century western world, the Church has been willing to evacuate its message of those elements likely to offend the modern scientific temper. Of necessity the Gospel must be interpreted afresh to each succeeding generation, but such an interpretation should be nothing more than the opening up of new lines of communication between the Church and the World; it is not (and must never be) a readiness to amend the content of the Gospel so as not to give offence.

Thirdly, churchmen themselves have to live in this atmosphere of worldly self-sufficiency. Unless they are on their guard and cleanse their lungs regularly with the breath of heaven, this seeping poison will cause a cancerous condition in their spiritual lungs that will end in the asphyxia of the soul.

The author maintains that if the Eternal Gospel were fully and fearlessly proclaimed, it might provoke animosity but it could not be treated with indifference.

The book claims to be "An Essay on the Christian Message in the Twentieth Century", but it is, in fact, not one essay but five, each complete in itself. In consequence the argument does not develop as the book proceeds. The reader is left in mid-air at the close of a chapter and has to return to *terra firma* by his own efforts before starting the next. This is both irritating and frustrating. If it could be made clear at the beginning that the book consists of five variations on the author's central theme, there would be no misunderstanding—and no frustration.

But this is a minor criticism of a valuable and stimulating book. As the chapter headings indicate, Mr Blamires brings us back to fundamentals. The first two are entitled, "The Contemporary Situation" and "Evasion of the Gospel"; the last two, "The Drag of Nature" and "The Church". The third and central one is called "The Language of Religious Thought". This perhaps more than any other breaks the book's sequence, but it is a concise yet comprehensive statement on an acute con-

temporary problem and warrants publication as a separate pamphlet (S.P.C.K. please note!).

This book has important things to say, and I hope it will be widely read. It incisively diagnoses the prevailing malady of our religion, and equally incisively prescribes the remedy: "The heresy of our day", writes Mr Blamires, "is the heresy of transforming Christianity into a corroborating religion. A corroborating religion ornaments the normal life with a supernatural sanction. Christianity does more than this: it transfigures the moral life with a supernatural penetration."

JOOST STEPNEY

PERSONAL RELIGION

PERSONAL SECURITY THROUGH FAITH. By L. R. DITZEN. SEA OF GLORY. By F. B. THORNTON. The World's Works (1913) Ltd. 16s. each.

In *Personal Security through Faith*, Dr Lowell Russell Ditzen seeks to show how to build up an inner citadel of security which will weather all the storms of life. Economic Security—Security in Service—through Achievement—through a Mature Evaluation of one's own Place and Worth—in spite of Tragedy—through a Growing Religious Faith and Life. . . . these are some of the chapter titles.

In his foreword Dr Sockman tells us that Dr Ditzen speaks each Sunday to an exacting congregation in a church crowded beyond capacity. It may well be that his speaking gifts and the nature of his congregation make the use of many illustrations and quotations easily acceptable to those who listen. But I found that to the reader their multiplicity tends to crush the main theme; for the mind is switched so swiftly from Robert E. Lee to Humphrey Bogart; from the Book of Proverbs to André Maurois; from Plutarch to *Gone with the Wind*; that I found myself having to look back at the chapter heading to recall the author's objective. I would suggest that this book is best used chapter by chapter—and in some cases section by section—as an aid to daily living; and I know that those who have to preach will not be able to resist borrowing some of Dr Ditzen's stories.

Sea of Glory is just the opposite of the previous book. I was glad that I was able to read it straight through at one sitting. Father Thornton has spent four years collecting information about four United States Chaplains who went down together on a battered troopship off Labrador in 1943. The story of the sinking forms but a brief prologue and epilogue. In between, the author has drawn with clarity and kindliness the portraits of these four men, two of them Free Churchmen, one a Rabbi, one a cheerful Irish Roman Catholic priest from New Jersey. He tells their life story swiftly and graphically. Here and there the English reader will be slightly puzzled through lack of local knowledge. (For instance, is it

both possible and usual for a Jewish Rabbi to be a constant and keen member of the Y.M.C.A. in the States?) But these are small points, compared with the way in which the author makes one feel the fund of stern resolve, devotion, and human kindness that animated these men. They all had a clear vocation. They all had a personal security through faith. Personally I found the story of the home life of the boy who was to become Rabbi Goode very moving; and how well he and John Washington, the Irish priest, must have understood each other's devotion to all that "home" meant to them.

Those who have not been on a sinking ship may accuse the author of overpainting the picture in the epilogue. Those who have will not.

The life story of these four chaplains will leave the reader in as little doubt as their surviving shipmates that their faith brought them to the haven where they would be.

GEORGE REINDORP

A SOCIAL GOSPEL

ONLY ONE WAY LEFT. By GEORGE MACLEOD. The Iona Community.
10s. 6d.

IN HIS preface Dr MacLeod sums up what this book is about: "So the writer actually claims to be a prophet, asks the reader. Why not? The essence of a Bible prophet is not that he forecasts the future. It is that he fears in his bones what is going to happen if we don't recover God's design right now. Is not this the motivation of every sincere Christian's ordinary actions? Would that all the Lord's people were prophets." Dr MacLeod seeks to discern in the present situation the activity of the Living and Moving God, whom he speaks of as One who is "furiously seeking men".

George MacLeod is Leader of the Iona Community. Among Presbyterian divines he is a figure of international fame, known as a preacher of great power. He has a profound sense of mission to those outside the Church, and his wide experience of parochial work throughout the years of the depression in industrial Scotland has shaped all his thinking since those years. His book is one which may take its place beside accounts of other experiments in making the parish the heart of Christian activity in a new way. Dr MacLeod refers favourably to the account of what the Reverend E. W. Southcott has been attempting in Leeds. It is in the unit of the local Christian community that the joining together of faith, worship, and action can be realized, so that God may be encountered there and Christian witness find that cutting edge which at the present, for Dr MacLeod, it sadly lacks.

The title, "Only one way left", contains an ambiguity which is no doubt deliberate. Christians must have a Left rather than a Right outlook in the present political situation inasmuch as our Western half of

the world owns 91 per cent of the income and the African and Asiatic half only 9 per cent and until there is some rectification of this disparity there is gross injustice to the poorer peoples, which Christians cannot accept if they are to be obedient to a righteous God. The urgent plea of Dr MacLeod is that people's imaginations and sympathies should be enlarged far beyond their average limits.

Only one way left is a reprint of lectures which Dr MacLeod delivered in Edinburgh and in New York. Hence the style is colloquial, there is some lack of connection between the themes, and unfortunately there are signs of careless proof-reading. Yet the fact that this is the spoken word transferred into print does permit the urgency and vividness of the lectures to come out. The Anglican reader will find that there is a flavour of the Scottish and American scenes with which he may be somewhat unfamiliar. Yet it is valuable in reminding him that other peoples are engaged in tasks which are similar to his own.

Dr MacLeod is very modest about his theological qualifications, but he is in fact in the line of Maurice, Gore, Scott Holland, and Temple in seeking to ground all social policy upon the great Biblical doctrines, and particularly upon those of Creation, Incarnation, and Redemption. Moreover, he is a "High Churchman" in the Biblical sense of that word, and has no place for a Christianity which is merely individualistic and private. It is through the Church, in the midst of the Christian congregation, that Christ is to be met as Prophet, as Priest, and as King, and Dr MacLeod throws out a number of suggestions which he urges his hearers to practice.

The touches of humour and the brilliant sayings which are scattered throughout these pages make the book readable. "Glory to God in the Highest must mean Glory to God in the High Street." Again, "Mark Twain once remarked that what worried him about the Bible was not the bits that he did not understand but the bits that he did understand." No man can read this book without being moved by the sincerity and urgency of the writer. One closes it with the feeling that something must be done about all this, but we still lack very clear detail on what actually ought to be done that in some sense is not being already done. The great prophetic themes have still to be translated into the actual situations in each local parish, and if Dr MacLeod's book can stimulate new experiments at that level it will not have failed in its purpose.

MARCUS KNIGHT

MORAL WELFARE

SEXUAL OFFENDERS AND SOCIAL PUNISHMENT. By D. S. BAILEY. Church Information Board. 6s. 6d.

THIS very valuable consideration of a grave moral problem consists mostly of the evidence supplied by the Moral Welfare Council to the Departmental Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution. It

is a relief to turn from scare headlines and hysterical articles to read this judicious appraisal of the situation and these sober suggestions for providing some alleviation.

The Bishop of St Albans in his foreword very properly contrasts the levity of the law in the matter of prostitution with its severity in the matter of homosexuality. The late Canon Hugh Warner, whose work in this field was universally admired, left behind some skilled advice for pastoral dealing with offenders of the latter sort, and this has been incorporated in Appendix II. The expert hand of the editor, Dr Sherwin Bailey, is obvious throughout.

The recommendations of the committee, if put into effect, would accomplish a revolution in English law on the subject. It will probably require a good deal of education before the general public will be ready to support them, but it would be difficult to prove that they would not make the law much more equitable and workable than it is at present. The recommendations are: A uniform law for accosting and solicitation of one sex by the other; no special legislation for "prostitution" and the excision of this term from the statute book; the omission of the phrase "for the purpose of prostitution" from the laws as implying an unprovable assumption; no interference by the law with the private irregular relationships of consenting men and women; the confining of State action to the protection of the citizen from annoyance and obstruction; and the refusal to convict in such cases except on the corroborated evidence of the person so annoyed or obstructed.

Whatever they may fail to do these recommendations bring to this vexed question an element of commonsense which is long overdue.

W.W.

AMERICAN HOMILETICS

LIFE LOOKS UP. By CHARLES B. TEMPLETON. The Worlds Work (1913)
Ltd. 12s. 6d.

THE author of these fourteen sermons has spoken in every state of the U.S.A. and in twelve European countries. Some of these actual sermons have been heard already by hundreds of thousands of Americans. They are intended as religious talks for a cross-section of contemporary American society. As the spoken word and with the author's personal gifts behind them, they were doubtless very effective and their limitations less obvious.

But the reader has time to wonder how much there is beyond a succession of preacher's clichés; to question whether the illustrations are always as apt as they are vivid, or some of the historical references more than superficially sound.

The reader in fact is tempted to criticize the published sermon for what it is not originally intended to be. As the spoken word, spoken to

Americans whose habit it is "to jump into the train after it has started and jump out before it has stopped and never once get left behind or break a leg", these talks are calculated to interest, to focus and hold attention on a series of worth-while points, and to induce a new moral resolve. Within these terms the author is a master of what he calls the homiletician's art.

Dr Templeton knows his audience—he assumes familiarity with the best known Bible stories and personalities only. He has always some special and perhaps unexpected point to make about them. He refers to well known modern authors with telling quotations. He never lets attention flag for a moment, no sentence is wasted.

The fundamental themes are: Trust in God; Finding God; Dedication of Life to God; Confidence because God "believes in you"; Prayer; Forgiveness; the Positive Difference in Life that Following Jesus makes; The True Picture of Jesus; The Gospel is real Good News; True Happiness. As he leads up to his conclusions, bubble after bubble of popular thinking is pricked. There are some very good short stories and countless quotable phrases. The advertisement "Be up to date. Get your antiques at Sawyer's" makes its own point; while startling statistics raise deep questions. "It is a sobering fact that one out of every two hospital beds in America is for a mental patient." It is pardonable to wonder if D. L. Moody really was "the greatest evangelist since the Apostle Paul". But it does not matter, and it is not the point he is making.

It is probable that many thousands who have heard the author preach will read these vigorous talks and recover something of their spiritual force. Others will read the book because of his fame and will get something out of it if they give themselves time for digestion. Talks so packed with epigrams can make indigestible reading. Each chapter is a full meal unless it is taken fairly superficially.

Others again will read them hoping to learn from an expert public speaker. They can hardly fail to take to heart the pains he takes to interest and illustrate in ways in tune with the live issues in the minds of his audience.

The limitations of his method are largely the limitations of the real situation in which he is speaking. The maximum effect of such speaking might seem to be to make many wish to inquire, wish to begin, or wish to begin again an attempt to find what the Christian way of thinking and living really is, for here are little more than some important headlines.

Those who do so will become a different audience, who will require a different diet even from sermons, and much that sermons can never provide.

There is nothing sectarian or unorthodox in the series, the content hardly goes far enough to raise such issues.

JOHN BREWIS

A WORTHY SECRETARY

HENRY NEWMAN: *An American in London, 1708-43.* By L. W. COWIE.
S.P.C.K. 30s.

WHO can know the eighteenth century? Boswell's Johnson and Nichols' Literary Anecdotes give one side, Fielding another, Wesley's Journal another, and so on. On the Church side Professor Sykes and Canon Carpenter give us both the facts and the prevailing spirit. The great value of Dr Cowie's book is that by letting a man of affairs speak for himself he enables us to relive the life of the period. The incidents are in themselves often trivial, but the resultive picture is impressive; a new source book for the social and religious history of the time has been provided.

Newman was a Harvard graduate of Puritan extraction, who came to England for business purposes, got into touch with the S.P.C.K. through his knowledge of Newfoundland, and was elected Secretary of the Society in 1708. Through a happy accident the rough drafts of his letters, private as well as official, have been preserved among the Society's archives. They form the main source, but Dr Cowie with great industry has tracked down the subsidiary sources, including those in the United States, which he visited for this purpose.

Our first impression will probably be, how modern it all is. The lineaments of the civilized English as we know them are clearly seen. After the fanatic and heroic seventeenth century, which has been described as an adolescent society, grown-up men appear, behaving with wisdom, restraint, and consideration; carrying nothing to an extreme and eschewing partisanship. There is nothing exciting about the projects and methods of the group of men at the head of S.P.C.K., but their good sense, liberality, and pertinacity are indeed laudable. They let themselves be guided by events and took up this or that piece of work as opportunity offered; there is no trace of "planning" as we understand the word. So we get Charity Schools, the Danish and German Mission to India assisted by S.P.C.K., the care for Protestant refugees from France, and for Germans who were taken to Georgia, and the continuous interest in the publication and distribution of Bibles, Prayer Books, and cheap religious literature generally.

In the centre of all is Newman, the Secretary, who brings the flavour of his personality into the routine of business. And, for a wonder, we are equally well-informed in respect of his private life. He emerges as a rarely attractive Anglican Puritan—cultured, devout, courteous, and humble. The men with whom he associated were most "Persons of Importance in their own Day", in Browning's phrase, and, as Chesterton said, of no importance in ours. But that applies to all studies in the by-ways of history. Newman deserves his resuscitation by Dr Cowie in this admirable book, in which clues have been followed up with great skill. Dr Cowie concludes by remarking on the comparative failure of S.P.C.K., the cooling of its original fervour for education, and its naïve

supposition that the crying evils of the time could be cured by tracts. But the Society never had the resources for doing much. It deliberately set its face against seeking aid from the State by being incorporated, which would have led to more support, and in essence remained one of the "religious societies" of the late seventeenth century. The conditions which would have made a campaign for raising funds possible did not exist.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE

MUSIC

HOW TO ENJOY MUSIC. By C. WHITAKER-WILSON. The World's Work (1913), Ltd. 12s. 6d.

OUT of his enormous experience as pianist, organist, and teacher of music Dr Whitaker-Wilson has written a most instructive and interesting book. He is full of an enthusiasm which, one may guess, has grown with the years.

Here is a book which sets out to do a job, and does it. It shows its readers "How to enjoy Music". Many people enjoy listening to music but have no technical knowledge. This book tells them what to listen for. Dr Whitaker-Wilson is a born teacher; he makes his points with apt illustration and writes fearlessly. One cannot always subscribe to his views, but they are offered with refreshing candour. We read: "My own musical instincts tell me—very definitely, too—that Brahms wrote four great symphonies, but I have long since given up trying to like any of them." There are two enthusiastic references to the singing of Compline at the monthly Saturday evening broadcasts. The author may like to know that this Office is sung by a selection of Vicars Choral (Choirmen) largely from St Paul's Cathedral, and not by priests as many listeners suppose.

We are told in the preface that the work is not intended for professional musicians, yet many would benefit greatly from a study of it. In these days of high technical standards the tendency is for the professional musician to specialize. Few have a wide knowledge of their art; the width of Dr Whitaker-Wilson's interest would surprise them.

The author speaks with authority for, as he tells us, he spent five years as an articled pupil to Dr Joseph Bridge at Chester Cathedral. He testifies to the value of the Cathedral tradition through his own musical ancestry. He claims through Joseph Bridge, Frederick Bridge, John Goss, Thomas Attwood, Mozart, J. C. Bach to be the eighth in direct line from J. S. Bach himself. He writes, in his chapter on "Organ, Church and Choral Music", with a remarkable sureness of touch and has much of interest to impart.

A glance at the chapter headings will show that the author ranges from "Music before the Classical Period" right through to "Music for Full Orchestra" and "Music for Voice and Stage". In a volume of this size he could not do more than sketch these vast subjects, but what he does write will undoubtedly stimulate the curiosity of his readers. They will then pursue their chosen interests as every teacher hopes his pupils will do.

How to enjoy Music can be most strongly recommended. It has the qualities one looks for in a book—a story worth telling and splendidly told.

HARRY GABB

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY

THE IMPERIAL INTELLECT. By A. DWIGHT CULLER. Yale University Press. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege. 40s.

THE sub-title describes the book as a study of Cardinal Newman's educational ideal. The imperial intellect is not, as one might have supposed from the portrait on the jacket, that of Newman himself but of his ideal university. The epithet "imperial" applies to the imposing and indeed universal sway exercised by such an institution over the whole field of knowledge. We can say at once that the book amply fulfils the implied promise of both titles. The author is admirably qualified for his task. He is a professor of English at Illinois, and has a beautiful command of English style as well as of his subject. He has also had direct access to the tremendous store of personal documents carefully preserved and docketed by Newman himself and left for the use and despair of posterity. We are told that there are many more manuscripts at the Oratory in Birmingham than the author had time to study, but we should be surprised if anything of importance for the present purpose has been omitted.

The book sticks closely to its educational theme, but it treats it in biographical fashion. We therefore get a strong new side-light on Newman's life and thought. This will be refreshing to many Anglican readers who have been inclined to confine themselves too rigidly to the future cardinal's connection with the Oxford Movement. There is enough here to show by implication the nature of the road that led Newman so strangely to become in turn Calvinist, Noetic, Anglo-Catholic, and Papalist. We can sympathize with him in his neurotic nature, his repeated academic disappointments, his genuine illnesses, and we can see that it was no path of dalliance that he trod in Ireland when at last he seemed to have the opportunity of putting his educational ideas into effect. The marvel is that through it all his own mind should

have maintained so much of that imperial character which he claims for a university.

Newman, says Dr Culler, was a seminal rather than an architectonic intelligence. Yet he was never happy unless he could systematize his ideas. As he says himself, "When we give reasons for alleged facts and reduce them into dependence on each other, we feel a satisfaction, which is wanting when we receive them as isolated and unaccountable". The search for final, all-comprehensive truth could only end where it began, in God, who is the source of all truth. That is the view by which Newman stood from the beginning to end of all his long disputes on educational principles. Let that be admitted in practice as well as in theory and your studies could be as secular as you liked. That was his "view", and we can well understand his dismay on going to Rome the year after his conversion and finding that there was no such view there, or indeed any other.

Altogether this is one of the most refreshing and enlightening books we have read for a long time. We found little at which to carp. It is not quite certain that the author has fully grasped the true inwardness of the tutorial system at Oriel; at any rate he makes it seem very complicated. And he certainly ought to notice that English undergraduates do not like being called "boys".

W.W.

A GENIAL CRITIC

A REBEL AT HEART: The Autobiography of a Nonconforming Churchman. By GUY ROGERS. Longmans, Green and Co. 16s. 6d.

FEW decisions taken at an Athenaeum lunch party could have had happier results. It was there that Canon Guy Rogers was persuaded to write his memoirs, which span some eighty years.

The author feels a certain uneasiness with regard to both the Church of Ireland of his early days and the Church of England of his later ministry. The former, as a minority, suffered from being cramped in its witness to the Social Gospel. The latter, for whose freedom he was to strive in Convocation, yielded too much, for his liking, to an Anglo-Catholic pressure group. The one lacked contact with the people while the other forfeited much of the influence that it had. The Church of England, though it offers wide freedom of thought to the individual clergyman, fails to provide him with as much liberty of practice. Those at high level are so concerned to perpetuate the Elizabethan compromise that they check the pressing of the contradictory principles enshrined in it. But this is qualified on page 50, where it is pointed out that the Church of England has never killed the pioneering spirit. Guy Rogers

emphasizes that the ministry on its human side has brought him his greatest happiness. Though he has thrilled to the preaching of the gospel, he admits that sacerdotal and even sacramental functions have not given him a comparable satisfaction. He testifies strongly to his dominant interest in individuals, and consequently sets great store by field-work. He is frank enough to admit that too many services can be a hindrance to the spiritual life, let alone a considerable trial!

Guy Rogers writes interestingly of his early up-bringing, which was in the hands of a maiden aunt, a strong-minded, but by no means objectionable woman. She primarily attributed her conversion to a decision to serve Christ, and spoke almost regrettably of the lack of emotional exuberance associated with it. There was none of the static condition which often accompanies the half-converted. Tension she had, but it was creative and not destructive. Her nephew, who was at her bedside when she died just before her eighty-eighth birthday, wept as he realized that there was no longer anyone in the world who looked upon him as a "boy".

There is a chapter, perhaps a trifle donnish, as if culled from other sources, on Trinity College, Dublin, of which Rogers was a member. He hazards the suggestion that, for its size and length of tradition, it compares favourably with any college in the world, for its distinguished sons. He writes, almost as fascinatingly of some of its Fellows as he does later on in the book, of certain Church dignitaries. It was during his time at Trinity that he realized his quality of self-assessment. Though he rather plays it down, because of the pragmatical approach to some of his weaker academic subjects, into which it led him, it stood him in good stead then and later. Guy Rogers always knew where to look for the humour which was to influence his own. Thus he speaks appreciatively of Provost Mahaffy's *obiter dicta* with their eighteenth-century flavour. That worthy when asked if he were a clergyman assented, but added, "Not in any objectionable way". In the same chapter, the author quotes from a sermon which he was later to preach before the University of Cambridge, in which he made an impassioned appeal for a more elastic training of ordinands. The clergy should be "middlemen", capable of conveying the thought of the University to the culture of an ordinary congregation. The clergyman ought to be acquainted with social problems and interested in politics. He should have, too, something of the barrister's ability, to make up a brief in a single night. His mind should be elastic, not inventive, quick rather than patient. Though some will feel the latter open to criticism, few will disagree with the author, that he should "know how to use the concrete with discretion, as the good housewife uses baking powder to make her bread rise."

Guy Rogers has some realistic things to say about conversion and ordination. "Never," he writes, "much to my regret, has the Lord spoken to me as I would wish at revival meetings." He is, as he hints, rather less than fair to himself when giving reasons for his choice of Holy Orders. But he does a service when he adds that "the clearness of the call

and its wholehearted acceptance are often exaggerated". He is critical of the Church of Ireland. It is not the Church of the people. More tidily and strictly governed than the Church of England, it has little room in it for the pioneering spirit. But he was particularly uneasy about its system of patronage. A clergyman out of favour with one board of nominators might find that his reputation had gone before him to another. Almost as bad was the position in episcopal appointments, where the failure, quite frequently, of a candidate to obtain a two-thirds majority in Synod, resulted in co-option by the House of Bishops.

St John's, Reading, as Rogers's first independent charge, brought him wider interests, closer ties, and greater freedom. No one could gainsay the usefulness of his incumbency, punctuated by a visit to West Canadian emigrants and terminated by a chaplaincy to the Armed Forces. Though he speaks critically of industrial conditions generally, he is happy to exempt the firm of Sutton Seeds from this indictment. Glowing, indeed, is the tribute which he pays to its senior partner, Leonard Sutton, who quite characteristically refused a knighthood.

The author modestly and humorously shows how, though a handless person, he became quite a favourite with a Guards brigade in which he served in the first World War. His experiences, ranging from the macabre to the almost hilarious, have a fine narrative quality.

During an eight years incumbency at West Ham, Guy Rogers secured the Royal Family's interest in his work, and some of them visited him on the site. He became a Royal Chaplain to four successive Sovereigns. His Labour Party friends warmly welcomed his presence on their platforms to preach the social gospel. But he was particularly interested in an experiment where four University-trained women worked with him and the curates, in moulding and developing the policy. One of them, Miss Marguerite Hartley, was later to return from New Zealand to marry him, and to be a close co-partner of his Birmingham ministry. How wise he was, incidentally, to accept the living of St Martin's and to turn down some previous offers!

Archbishop Davidson was appreciative of Guy Rogers's efforts in Convocation and elsewhere. But the author, quite refreshingly, does not hesitate to tell the reader that he did not get on with his successor. The safety-first outlook which developed politically under Baldwin was canvassed by the Church after Barnes's appointment to Birmingham. It simply was not favourable to the making of bishops who could have been a disturbing influence. There is an arresting description of his own waging of war for a more liberal attitude to inter-communion, the ministry of women, and re-marriage after divorce. How he deprecated the fact that Holy Communion, which should have been the Citadel of unity, had become the storm-centre of controversy! He pleaded strongly for the humanizing of the Prayer Book, but was able to vote for the 1927 Revision in the Assembly, "only with reluctance and unease of mind". He heralded the House of Commons' rejection with delight, disliking so intensely the ecclesiastical politics behind the Deposited Book. But his admission, that such liberalism as there was in the Church

Assembly came from the bishops, tends to qualify rather curiously his statement in the preface (p. viii) about their ultra-anxiety to perpetuate the Elizabethan compromise. He writes, very modestly, of his St Martin's ministry which was outstanding, and in some ways, epoch-making. There was the closest liaison with both Carr's Lane Church and the Methodist Central Hall. The lunch-hour services at St Martin's, at which women too were invited to preach, survived even the exigencies of war-time.

The reader's curiosity is whetted by Rogers's refusal of the Deanery of Manchester and the Archbispopric of Melbourne, a decision taken after consultation with Bishop Barnes. Would it be too inquisitive to ask for more reassuring reasons?

The chapter on Barnes is perhaps the best in the book. It is pre-eminently fair, while free from hero-worship. Intense respect for his intellect and admiration of his convictions, is accompanied by a searching criticism of his harshness. He did not go out of his way to put himself into a favourable light with his opponents. Controversy was the debt that he owed to truth. The freedom which he allowed Rogers was greatly appreciated.

The author writes even affectionately of the close liaison with the Jewish community. Visits to America are colourfully described with a wealth of detail where the transatlantic personalities come into the picture. But searching indeed is the chapter which deals with preaching and preachers. Here again, Guy Rogers is man enough to quote unfavourable comments on some of his own efforts. He is, however, forced in all honesty to show how ardently he believes in preaching, and to admit success. His aunt felt that his Old Testament sermons were his best. This he attributes to the quite dramatic figures, so faithfully portrayed, in their varying shades of good and evil, in the Old Testament, which fairly pulsates with life. "I liked", comments the author, "the concrete and the human—the intimate and the particular." The autobiography is happily rounded off with its writer living contentedly in semi-retirement. He continues to enjoy to the full his preaching ministry, and, untrammeled by ecclesiastical status, fulfils the prophetic rôle in yet another generation.

GILBERT SLATER